arXiv:1704.04578v1 [math.OC] 15 Apr 2017

On Synchronous, Asynchronous, and Randomized Best-Response schemes for computing equilibria in Stochastic Nash games

Jinlong Lei Uday V. Shanbhag Jong-Shi Pang Suvrajeet Sen *

Abstract

In this work, we consider a stochastic Nash game in which each player solves a parameterized stochastic optimization problem. In deterministic regimes, best-response schemes have been shown to be convergent under a suitable spectral property associated with the proximal best-response map. However, a direct application of this scheme to stochastic settings requires obtaining exact solutions to stochastic optimization problems at each iteration. Instead, we propose an *inexact* generalization of this scheme in which an inexact solution to the best-response problem is computed via an increasing number of projected stochastic gradient steps. On the basis of this framework, we present three inexact best-response schemes: (i) First, we propose a synchronous inexact best-response scheme where all players simultaneously update their strategies; (ii) Subsequently, we extend this to a randomized setting where a subset of players is randomly chosen to their update strategies while the other players keep their strategies invariant; (iii) Finally, we propose an asynchronous scheme, where each player determines its own update frequency and may use outdated rival-specific data in updating its strategy. Under a suitable contractive property of the proximal best-response map, we proceed to derive a.s. convergence of the iterates for (i) and (ii) and mean-convergence for (i) – (iii). In addition, we show that for (i) – (iii), the produced iterates converge to the unique equilibrium in mean at a prescribed linear rate with a prescribed constant rather than a sub-linear rate. Finally, we establish the overall iteration complexity of the scheme in terms of projected stochastic gradient steps for computing an $\epsilon-$Nash equilibrium and note that in all settings, the iteration complexity is $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{2(1+c)+\delta})$ where $c = 0$ in the context of (i) and represents the positive cost of randomization (in (ii)) and asynchronicity and delay (in (iii)). The schemes are further extended to settings where players solve two-stage recourse-based stochastic Nash games with linear and quadratic recourse. Finally, we apply the developed methods to a multi-portfolio investment problem, and carry out numerical simulations to demonstrate the rate and complexity statements.

1 Introduction

Nash games represent an important subclass of noncooperative games [6, 7] and are rooted in the seminal work by Nash in 1950 [8]. In the Nash equilibrium problem (NEP), there is a finite set of players, where each player aims at maximizing its own payoff function over a player-specific strategy set, given the rivals' strategies. Nash's eponymous solution concept requires that at an equilibrium no player can improve its payoff by unilaterally deviating from its equilibrium strategy. Over the last several decades, there has been a surge of interest in utilizing Nash games to model a range of problems in control theory and decision-making with applications in communication networks, signal processing, electricity markets, (cf. [9–14]). In recent years, stochastic Nash equilibrium models have found particular relevance in power markets [15–20]. Motivated by those applications, we consider an N-player stochastic Nash game, where each player involves solving a stochastic constrained optimization problem parameterized by the rivals' strategies. This work aims at analyzing a broad class of distributed best-response

*Lei and Shanbhag (corresponding) are with the Department of Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA while Pang and Sen are with the Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering at University of Southern California in Los Angeles jxl800,udaybag@psu.edu, jongship,s.sen@usc.edu. This research was partially supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation grant CMMI-1538605 and CAREER award CMMI-1246887 (Shanbhag). Additionally, a preliminary version of this work appeared in the Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control [40].

schemes for computing a Nash equilibrium in regimes complicated by uncertainty, delay, asynchronicity, and randomized update rules.

Computation of Nash equilibria has been a compelling concern for the last several decades. As such game-theoretic models have gained wider usage in networked regimes, the need for distributed algorithms has become paramount. In particular, such algorithms require that the schemes respect the privacy concerns of users and are implementable over networked regimes. For instance, in flow control and routing problems in communication networks, gradient-based schemes have proved particularly useful [9–13, 21]. Such schemes generally impose a suitable monotonicity property on the map to ensure global convergence of iterates. Gradient-based schemes are characterized by ease of implementation and lower complexity in terms of each player step. Yet, such schemes are not "fully rational" since selfish players may deviating the update schemes unless they are forced by some authority to follow such gradient-based schemes. In best-response schemes, players select their best-response, given the current strategies of its rivals' (cf. [7, 22]). While there has been some effort to extend such schemes to engineered settings (cf. [1, 2]), in which the best-response of each player can be expressed in a closed form. Proximal best-response schemes appear to have first discussed by Facchinei and Pang in 2009 [3]. In subsequent work, asynchronous extensions to these proximal schemes were applied to a class of optimization problems [4] while in [14], a framework that relied on solving a sequence of NEPs was proposed to solve a class of monotone Nash games. In regimes with expectation-valued payoffs, there has been far less computational research. Sampled and smoothed counterparts of the iterative regularization schemes presented in [21] were considered in [5] and [23]. However, much of this work considered settings where the integrands of the expectation were differentiable, ruling out the incorporation of two-stage recourse. Further, much of the past work in computing Nash equilibria has focused on risk-neutral problems with the sole exception being [17], where gradient methods were combined with cutting-plane schemes. In recent work, the last three authors have considered Nash games characterized by risk-aversion as well as two-stage recourse and have examined a smoothing-based sampling scheme that is more aligned with sample average approximation (SAA) techniques [24]. *Yet, the question of computing a Nash equilibrium via natively distributed best-response schemes in stochastic regimes in settings complicated by delay, asynchronicity, and two-stage recourse remains a compelling open question*, motivating the current research.

Challenge and motivation: A natural question is why does it remain challenging to extend best-response schemes to stochastic regimes? When contending with Nash games where each player's payoff function is expectation-valued, computing a best-response requires solving a stochastic optimization exactly or accurately. Unfortunately, unless this best-response problem is convex and the expectation as well as its gradients are available as closed-form expressions, extensions of best-response schemes to the stochastic regime remain impractical since the best-response problem is essentially a stochastic optimization problem and requires Monte-Carlo sampling schemes [25]; in effect, this leads to a two-loop scheme in which the upper loop represents the best-response iterations while the lower loop captures the solution of the best-response problem. Practical implementations of such schemes that provide asymptotically accurate solutions at each step remain unavailable and at best, this avenue provides a rather coarse approximation of the equilibrium.

A single-loop approach: Instead, we consider develop single-loop *inexact* best-response schemes that are practically implementable; here the best-response is computed *inexactly* in an expected-value sense but require that the inexactness sequence be driven to zero. This is achieved by utilizing a stochastic approximation scheme that utilizes an increasing number of (stochastic) projected gradient steps. Note that in comparison with a two-loop scheme, in this setting, the "inside loop" requires a known number of iterations, thereby making this scheme a single-loop scheme. While this is a relatively simple scheme, the resulting convergence of iterates is by no means guaranteed and claiming optimality of the rate is far from immediate. In fact, convergence of best-response schemes holds under diverse settings requiring either that the proximal-response map (defined later) admits a suitable contractive property or requiring that player objectives admit a potential function (cf. [3, 22]). Our work draws inspiration from the work by Facchinei and Pang [3] in which the contractive property of the proximal response map is employed as a tool to ensure convergence of the iterates produced by the best-response scheme.

Contributions: Given the inherent challenges in solving this problem in finite time, we consider several *inexact* variants of this scheme and make the following contributions that are summarized in Table 1:

(i) ***Synchronous schemes:*** We propose a synchronous inexact proximal best-response scheme to find the Nash equilibrium, and establish almost sure convergence and mean convergence of the iterates to the unique equilibrium when the proximal best-response map admits a contraction. Furthermore, it is shown that when the inexactness sequence is dropped at a suitable rate, the rate of convergence of the iterates is **linear** or geometric rather than **sub-linear**. Based on this linear rate of convergence for the best-response iterates, by assuming that an inexact solution is computed via a stochastic approximation, we provide the overall iteration complexity in projected stochastic gradient steps for computing an ϵ-Nash equilibrium and show that the overall iteration complexity is $\mathcal{O}(N^{1+\delta/2}/\epsilon^{2+\delta})$ where $\delta > 0$. In addition, the derived upper bound satisfies $\Omega(N/\epsilon^2)$. Furthermore, for a specific selection of the algorithmic parameters, the overall iteration complexity is shown to be exactly of $\mathcal{O}(N/\epsilon^2)$ which is optimal for the resolution of stochastic convex optimizations by standard stochastic approximation schemes.

(ii) ***Randomized extension:*** Subsequently, a randomized inexact proximal best-response scheme motivated by [26, 27] is proposed, in which a subset of players is randomly chosen to update in each iteration according to some binary variables. To be specific, each player i is chosen with some positive probability p_i at each major iteration. This randomized protocol allows players to initiate an update according to a local clock, e.g, the Poisson clock, and locally choose the inexact sequence. With some suitable selected inexact sequence, the estimates are shown to converge to the Nash equilibrium almost surely and in mean at a prescribed linear rate. The expectation of the overall number of projected gradient steps to compute an $\epsilon-$Nash equilibrium is shown to be $\mathcal{O}((\sqrt{N}/\epsilon)^{2\ln(\tilde{\eta}_0^{-1})/\ln(\tilde{\eta}^{-1})+\delta}$ where $\delta > 0$ and both $\tilde{\eta}$ and $\tilde{\eta}_0$ are defined in (38) and (41), respectively. Further, as noted in Remark 7, this bound is worse than that shown for the synchronous algorithm, a consequence of the randomized index selection scheme that accommodates much flexibility into the update scheme.

(iii) ***Asynchronous and delay-tolerant schemes:*** Synchronous algorithms require players to update their strategies simultaneously, but this is often difficult to mandate in networked settings with a large collection of noncooperative players. Additionally, players may often not have access to their rivals' latest strategies. Motivated by the asynchronous algorithm specified in [28] we propose an asynchronous inexact proximal best-response scheme, where each player determines its update time while using possibly outdated rival information. Yet, we assume that each player updates at least once in any time interval of length B_1, and that the communication delays are uniformly bounded by B_2. When the proximal best-response map is contractive in the infinity-norm, the iterates are proved to converge in mean to the unique equilibrium at a linear rate for an appropriately chosen inexactness sequence. Furthermore, we derive the overall iteration complexity of the projected stochastic gradient steps for computing an $\epsilon-$Nash equilibrium and show that the complexity bound is of $\mathcal{O}\Big((1/\epsilon)^{2B_1\left(1+\lceil\frac{B_2}{B_1}\rceil\right)+\delta}\Big)$ for $\delta > 0$. Specially, if the players update in a cyclic fashion, then the complexity bound improves to $\mathcal{O}\Big((1/\epsilon)^{2\left(1+\lceil\frac{B_2}{N}\rceil+\delta\right)}\Big)$.

(iv) ***Incorporating private two-stage recourse:*** To show that all the aforementioned avenues can be extended to accommodate recourse-based objectives arising from two-stage stochastic programming [29], we consider an extended stochastic NEP where each player solves a two-stage stochastic program with recourse. We separately investigate the case of linear and quadratic recourse with a particular accent on computing subgradients of the random recourse function. On the basis of the existence and boundedness of the stochastic subgradient, the proposed synchronous, randomized, and asynchronous inexact proximal best-response algorithms are still applicable and the formulated convergence results hold as well.

(v) ***Preliminary numerics:*** Finally, we apply the proposed schemes on a portfolio selection problem. Our numerical studies suggest that the empirical behavior corresponds well with the rate statements and the complexity

bounds.

Update scheme	Asymptotic convergence	Rate of convergence	Iteration complexity of $\epsilon-$NE
Synchronous (Algorithm 1)	a.s. convergence (Proposition 2) mean convergence (Proposition 3)	geometric (Proposition 4)	Proposition 5: $\mathcal{O}\left((\sqrt{N}/\epsilon)^{2+\delta}\right)$ Corollary 1: $\mathcal{O}(N/\epsilon^2)$
Randomized (Algorithm 2)	a.s. convergence (Lemma 4) mean convergence (Lemma 5)	geometric (Lemma 5)	Theorem 2: $\mathcal{O}\left((\sqrt{N}/\epsilon)^{2\ln(\tilde{\eta}_0^{-1})/\ln(\tilde{\eta}^{-1})+\delta}\right)$
Asynchronous (Algorithm 3) (using $\|.\|_\infty$ norm)	mean convergence (Lemma 7)	geometric (Lemma 7)	Theorem 4(a): $\mathcal{O}\left((1/\epsilon)^{2B_1\left(1+\lceil\frac{B_2}{B_1}\rceil\right)+\delta}\right)$ Theorem 4(b): $\mathcal{O}\left((1/\epsilon)^{2\left(1+\lceil\frac{B_2}{N}\rceil\right)+\delta}\right)$ for cyclic update

Table 1: Summary of Contributions

Organization: The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we formulate the stochastic Nash game, provide some basic assumptions and then provide some background on the proximal best-response map. In Section 3, we introduce a synchronous inexact proximal best-response scheme, derive rate statements, and analyze the overall iteration complexity when an inexact solution to the best-response problem is solved via a stochastic approximation scheme. A randomized and an asynchronous inexact proximal best-response scheme are proposed in Sections 4 and 5, respectively, with the rate and complexity statements established. Finally, all the proposed avenues are extended to accommodate recourse-based objectives in Section 6. We present some numerical results in Section 7 and conclude in Section 8 with a brief summary of our main findings.

Notations: When referring to a vector x, it is assumed to be a column vector while x^T denotes its transpose. Generally, $\|x\|$ denotes the Euclidean vector norm, i.e., $\|x\| = \sqrt{x^T x}$, while other norms will be specified appropriately (such as the 1-norm or the ∞-norm). We use $\Pi_X[x]$ to denote the Euclidean projection of a vector x on a set X, i.e., $\Pi_X[x] = \min_{y\in X} \|x - y\|$. We write *a.s.* as the abbreviation for "almost surely". We use $\mathbb{E}[z]$ to denote the expectation of a random variable z. For of a square matrix A, we denote by $\rho(A)$ the spectral radius and by $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ the smallest eigenvalue of $\frac{A+A^T}{2}$. For a real number x, we define by the ceiling function $\lceil x\rceil$ the smallest integer greater than x and by the floor function $\lfloor x\rfloor$ the the largest integer smaller than x.

2 Problem Formulation and Preliminaries

2.1 Problem Statement

There exists a set of N players indexed by i where $i \in \mathcal{N} \triangleq \{1, \cdots, N\}$. For any $i \in \mathcal{N}$, the ith player has a strategy set $X_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and a payoff function $f_i(x_i, x_{-i})$ depending on its own strategy x_i and on the vector of rivals' strategies $x_{-i} \triangleq \{x_j\}_{j\neq i}$. Suppose $n \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^N n_i$, $X \triangleq \prod_i X_i$ and $X_{-i} \triangleq \prod_{j\neq i} X_j$. Let us consider a stochastic setting of the Nash equilibrium problem denoted by (SNash), in which the objective of player i, given rivals' strategies x_{-i}, is to solve the following constrained stochastic optimization problem

$$\min_{x_i\in X_i} \quad f_i(x_i, x_{-i}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\left[\psi_i(x_i, x_{-i}; \xi(\omega))\right], \qquad (\text{SNash}_i(x_{-i}))$$

where $\psi_i(\cdot) : X \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is a scalar-valued function, and the expectation is taken with respect to the random vector $\xi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d$ defined on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. A Nash equilibrium (NE) $x^* = \{x_i^*\}_{i=1}^N$ of the stochastic Nash game (SNash) satisfies the following:

$$x_i^* \text{ solves} \quad (\text{SNash}_i(x_{-i}^*)), \ \ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}.$$

In other words, x^* is an NE if no player can improve the payoff by unilaterally deviating from the strategy x_i^*.

For notational simplicity, ξ is used to denote $\xi(\omega)$ throughout the paper. In this work, we assume that for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $f_i(x_i, x_{-i})$ and $\psi_i(x_i, x_{-i}; \xi)$ is smooth in x_i for every given x_{-i} and ξ. Further, there exists a stochastic oracle such that for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and every given x, ξ returns a sample $\nabla_{x_i}\psi_i(x_i, x_{-i}; \xi)$, which is an unbiased estimator of $\nabla_{x_i} f_i(x_i, x_{-i})$. We impose the following conditions on the stochastic Nash game.

Assumption 1 *Let the following hold.*
(a) X_i is a closed, compact, and convex set;
(b) $f_i(x_i, x_{-i})$ is convex and twice continuously differentiable in x_i over an open set containing X_i for every $x_{-i} \in X_{-i}$;
(c) For all $x_{-i} \in X_{-i}$ and any $\omega \in \Omega$, $\psi_i(x_i, x_{-i}; \xi(\omega))$ is differentiable in x_i over an open set containing X_i such that $\nabla_{x_i} f_i(x_i, x_{-i}) = \mathbb{E}[\nabla_{x_i} \psi_i(x_i, x_{-i}; \xi)]$;
(d) For any $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and all $x \in X$, there exists a constant $M_i > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla_{x_i} \psi_i(x_i, x_{-i}; \xi)\|^2] \leq M_i^2$.

2.2 Background on proximal best-response maps

In this paper, we consider the class of stochastic Nash games in which the proximal best-response map (which is defined subsequently) admits a contractive property [3]. Suppose $\widehat{x}(y)$ is defined as follows:

$$\widehat{x}(y) \triangleq \operatorname*{argmin}_{x \in X} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\left[\psi_i(x_i, y_{-i}; \xi)\right] + \frac{\mu}{2}\|x - y\|^2 \right]. \tag{1}$$

It is easily seen that the objective function is now separable in x_i and (1) reduces to a set of player-specific proximal best-response problems of which the ith problem is given by the following:

$$\widehat{x}_i(y) \triangleq \operatorname*{argmin}_{x_i \in X_i} \left[\mathbb{E}\left[\psi_i(x_i, y_{-i}; \xi)\right] + \frac{\mu}{2}\|x_i - y_i\|^2 \right]. \tag{2}$$

Analogous to the avenue adopted in [3], we may define the $N \times N$ real matrix $\Gamma = [\gamma_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^N$:

$$\Gamma \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\mu}{\mu+\zeta_{1,\min}} & \frac{\zeta_{12,\max}}{\mu+\zeta_{1,\min}} & \cdots & \frac{\zeta_{1N,\max}}{\mu+\zeta_{1,\min}} \\ \frac{\zeta_{21,\max}}{\mu+\zeta_{2,\min}} & \frac{\mu}{\mu+\zeta_{2,\min}} & \cdots & \frac{\zeta_{2N,\max}}{\mu+\zeta_{2,\min}} \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ \frac{\zeta_{N1,\max}}{\mu+\zeta_{N,\min}} & \frac{\zeta_{N2,\max}}{\mu+\zeta_{N,\min}} & \cdots & \frac{\mu}{\mu+\zeta_{N,\min}} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3}$$

with

$$\zeta_{i,\min} \triangleq \inf_{x \in X} \lambda_{\min}\left(\nabla^2_{x_i} f_i(x)\right) \;\text{ and }\; \zeta_{ij,\max} \triangleq \sup_{x \in X} \|\nabla^2_{x_i x_j} f_i(x)\| \;\; \forall j \neq i. \tag{4}$$

Then we obtain the following inequality:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \|\widehat{x}_1(y') - \widehat{x}_1(y)\| \\ \vdots \\ \|\widehat{x}_N(y') - \widehat{x}_N(y)\| \end{pmatrix} \leq \Gamma \begin{pmatrix} \|y'_1 - y_1\| \\ \vdots \\ \|y'_N - y_N\| \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5}$$

If the spectral radius $\rho(\Gamma) < 1$, then there exist a scalar $a \in (0,1)$ and monotonic norm $|\,\|\bullet\|\,|$ such that

$$\left| \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|\widehat{x}_1(y') - \widehat{x}_1(y)\| \\ \vdots \\ \|\widehat{x}_N(y') - \widehat{x}_N(y)\| \end{pmatrix} \right\| \right| \leq a \left| \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|y'_1 - y_1\| \\ \vdots \\ \|y'_N - y_N\| \end{pmatrix} \right\| \right|. \tag{6}$$

Note that these sufficient conditions for the contractive property of the best-response map $\widehat{x}(\bullet)$ are provided in [3, Proposition 12.17].

Remark 1 *Let $D_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ $\forall i \in \mathcal{N}$ be any arbitrary chosen nonsingular matrices. Define*

$$\zeta_{i,\min} \triangleq \inf_{x \in X} \lambda_{\min}\left(D_i^T \nabla^2_{x_i} f_i(x) D_i\right), \; \zeta_{ij,\max} \triangleq \sup_{x \in X} \|D_i^T \nabla^2_{x_i x_j} f_i(x) D_j\| \;\; \forall j \neq i.$$

It is easily seen that definition (4) *is only a special case with* $D_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ *being an identity matrix. By making simple modifications to the proof given in [3, Section 12.6.1] we are able to obtain the inequality* (5) *with* Γ *defined by* (3)*. Just as that delievered in [14], matrices* $D_i \; \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$ *give us an additional degree of freedom in deriving the contraction property of the proximal best-response map* $\widehat{x}(\bullet)$.

As mentioned earlier, the proximal best-response $\widehat{x}_i(y)$ requires solving a stochastic optimization problem defined in (2). Stochastic optimization problems have been studied extensively over the last several decades through Monte-Carlo sampling schemes. Amongst them, sample-average approximation (SAA) and stochastic approximation are the most popular approaches. SAA solves the stochastic optimization problem via a methodology that firstly estimates the expected objective function by sample averaging, then solves a deterministic optimization problem. Asymptotic convergence and error bounds for the SAA estimators have been extensively investigated in [25]. Stochastic approximation was first considered by Robbins and Monro [30] for seeking roots of a regression function with noisy observations. Such schemes have found wide applications in stochastic problems such as convex optimization, variational inequality, systems and control problems. In this work, we apply the stochastic approximation scheme to estimate the optimal solution of the stochastic best-response problem (2).

3 A synchronous inexact proximal best-response scheme

In this section, we present a synchronous inexact proximal best-response scheme. In the context of this scheme, we proceed to analyze the associated convergence properties with rate statements, and derive the overall iteration complexity.

3.1 Description of algorithm

Recall that the exact proximal best-response $\widehat{x}_i(y_k)$ is defined as the following:

$$\widehat{x}_i(y_k) \triangleq \underset{x_i \in X_i}{\operatorname{argmin}} \big[f_i(x_i, y_{-i,k}) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x_i - y_{i,k}\|^2 \big]. \tag{7}$$

Since $f_i(x_i, y_{-i,k})$ is the expectation of $\psi_i(x_i, y_{-i,k}; \xi)$ with respect to ξ, a closed-form expression of $\widehat{x}_i(y_k)$ is unavailable. Instead we propose an inexact proximal best-response scheme (Algorithm 1) computing an *inexact* best-response that satisfies (8) rather than computing the exact best-response, which is available only in an asymptotic sense. It is worth pointing out that $\mathcal{F}_k$ in equation (8) denotes the σ-field of the entire information used by the algorithm up to (and including) the update of x_k. We will further define $\mathcal{F}_k$ in Section 3.4 and specify the deterministic sequence $\{\alpha_{i,k}\}_{k \geq 0}$ in Algorithm 1 when we proceed to investigate the convergence properties.

Algorithm 1 Inexact proximal best-response scheme for stochastic Nash games

Let $k := 0$, $y_{i,0} = x_{i,0} \in X_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$; Let $\{\alpha_{i,k}\}_{k \geq 0}$ be a given sequence for $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

(1) For $i = 1, \ldots, N$, let $x_{i,k+1}$ be defined as follows:

$$x_{i,k+1} \in \left\{ z \in X_i : \mathbb{E}\left[\|z - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_k \right] \leq \alpha_{i,k}^2 \;\; a.s. \right\}. \tag{8}$$

(2) For $i = 1, \ldots, N$, $y_{i,k+1} := x_{i,k+1}$;

(3) $k := k + 1$; If $k < K$, return to (1); else STOP.

3.2 Convergence analysis

We now proceed to analyze this scheme in greater detail and initiate our discussion by noting the convergence of the exact best-response scheme.

Proposition 1 ([3]) *Consider the stochastic Nash game in which the ith player solves (SNash$_i(x_{-i})$), given $x_{-i} \in X_{-i}$. Let the sequence of exact responses be denoted by $\{y_k^\infty\}_{k=1}^\infty$. Assume that the matrix Γ defined by* (3) *satisfies $\rho(\Gamma) < 1$. Then the following hold:*

(i) The contraction given by (6) *holds for the proximal best-response map.*

(ii) For $i = 1, \cdots, N$, the best-response iterates $y_{i,k}^\infty \to x_i^*$ as $k \to \infty$

Naturally, one can derive the uniqueness of the Nash equilibrium from the existence of this contractive property (cf. [3]). We prove that the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ generated by Algorithm 1 converges almost surely and in expectation to the unique Nash equilibrium of the stochastic Nash game in Propositions 2 and 3, respectively. The results rely on comparing the inexact responses with the exact best-response map, which is known to be contractive by the following sufficient condition:

Assumption 2 *The Γ matrix defined in* (3) *satisfies $\|\Gamma\| < 1$.*

Define $a = \|\Gamma\|$. Then $a \in (0, 1)$ by Assumption 2, and hence by (5) we obtain the following:

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|\widehat{x}_1(y') - \widehat{x}_1(y)\| \\ \vdots \\ \|\widehat{x}_N(y') - \widehat{x}_N(y)\| \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq a \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|y_1' - y_1\| \\ \vdots \\ \|y_N' - y_N\| \end{pmatrix} \right\| \quad \forall y, y' \in X. \tag{9}$$

We utilize the following lemma for random and deterministic recursions to prove the almost sure convergence and mean convergence, respectively.

Lemma 1 *(a) [31, Lemma 2.2.10] Let $\{v_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ be a sequence of random variables, $v_k \geq 0$, $\mathbb{E}[v_0] < \infty$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[v_{k+1}|v_0, \cdots, v_k] \leq q_k v_k + \zeta_k,\ 0 \leq q_k < 1,\ \zeta_k \geq 0,$$
$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(1 - q_k) = \infty,\ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \zeta_k < \infty,\ \text{and } \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\zeta_k}{1 - q_k} = 0.$$

Then $v_k \to 0$ $a.s.$
(b) [31, Lemma 2.2.3] Let $u_{k+1} \leq q_k u_k + \zeta_k$, $0 \leq q_k < 1$, $\zeta_k \geq 0$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(1 - q_k) = \infty \text{ and } \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\zeta_k}{1 - q_k} = 0.$$

Then $\limsup_{k\to\infty} u_k \leq 0$. In particular, if $u_k \geq 0$, then $\lim_{k\to\infty} u_k = 0$.

Proposition 2 (Almost Sure Convergence) *Let the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ be generated by Algorithm 1. Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, and that $\alpha_{i,k} \geq 0$ with $\sum_{k=0}^\infty \alpha_{i,k} < \infty$ for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Then for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$,*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} x_{i,k} = x_i^* \ \ a.s.$$

Proof. We begin by noting that $x_i^* = \widehat{x}_i(x^*)$ and examine $\|x_{i,k+1} - x_i^*\|$:

$$\|x_{i,k+1} - x_i^*\| \leq \|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\| + \|\widehat{x}_i(y_k) - \widehat{x}_i(x^*)\|, \tag{10}$$

where the inequality follows from the triangle inequality. Furthermore, by the contractive property (9) of $\widehat{x}(\bullet)$ and $y_k = x_k$, we have the following bound:

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|\widehat{x}_1(y_k) - \widehat{x}_1(x^*)\| \\ \vdots \\ \|\widehat{x}_N(y_k) - \widehat{x}_N(x^*)\| \end{pmatrix} \right\| = \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|\widehat{x}_1(x_k) - \widehat{x}_1(x^*)\| \\ \vdots \\ \|\widehat{x}_N(x_k) - \widehat{x}_N(x^*)\| \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq a \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|x_{1,k} - x_1^*\| \\ \vdots \\ \|x_{N,k} - x_N^*\| \end{pmatrix} \right\|. \tag{11}$$

Consequently, from (10) by the triangle inequality, we obtain the following inequality:

$$v_{k+1} \triangleq \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|x_{1,k+1} - x_1^*\| \\ \vdots \\ \|x_{N,k+1} - x_N^*\| \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq a \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|x_{1,k} - x_1^*\| \\ \vdots \\ \|x_{N,k} - x_N^*\| \end{pmatrix} \right\| + \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|x_{1,k+1} - \widehat{x}_1(y_k)\| \\ \vdots \\ \|x_{N,k+1} - \widehat{x}_N(y_k)\| \end{pmatrix} \right\|. \tag{12}$$

Denote by $\alpha_{\max,k} \triangleq \max_i \alpha_{i,k}$. Then by (8) and conditional Jensen's inequality $\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\|X\| \middle| \mathcal{F}\right]\right)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\|X\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}\right]$, we have the following for all $k \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|x_{1,k+1} - \widehat{x}_1(y_k)\| \\ \vdots \\ \|x_{N,k+1} - \widehat{x}_N(y_k)\| \end{pmatrix} \right\| \middle| \mathcal{F}_k \right] \leq & \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^N \|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k \right]} \\ \leq & \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_{i,k}^2} \leq \sqrt{N} \alpha_{\max,k} \ \ a.s. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

By taking expectations conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_k$ with respect to both sides of (12), from (13) we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[v_{k+1}|\mathcal{F}_k] \leq a v_k + \sqrt{N} \alpha_{\max,k} \ \ a.s. \tag{14}$$

Since $\sum_k (1-a) = \infty$ and $\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\alpha_{\max,k}}{(1-a)} = 0$, by Lemma 1(a) and the summability of $\alpha_{\max,k}$, we conclude that

$$v_k \to 0 \ \ a.s.$$

Consequently, the result follows by v_k defined as in (12). □

Proposition 3 *Let the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ be generated by Algorithm 1. Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, and that $\alpha_{i,k} \geq 0$ with $\lim_{k\to\infty} \alpha_{i,k} = 0$ for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Then for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$, we have the following assertions:*

*(a) (***convergence in mean***)* $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|] = 0$.

*(b) (***convergence of the variance of** x_k*)* $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{V}ar(x_k) = 0$.

Proof. (a) By taking expectations to both sides of (12), from (13) we have that

$$\underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|x_{1,k+1} - x_1^*\| \\ \vdots \\ \|x_{N,k+1} - x_N^*\| \end{pmatrix} \right\| \right]}_{\triangleq u_{k+1}} \leq a\mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|x_{1,k} - x_1^*\| \\ \vdots \\ \|x_{N,k} - x_N^*\| \end{pmatrix} \right\| \right] + \sqrt{N} \alpha_{\max,k}. \tag{15}$$

This can then be cast as a deterministic recursion of the form:

$$u_{k+1} \leq a u_k + \sqrt{N} \alpha_{\max,k} \quad \forall k \geq 0. \tag{16}$$

The fact that a is a constant scalar in $(0,1)$ implying that $\sum_k (1-a) = \infty$. Furthermore, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\alpha_{\max,k}}{(1-a)} = 0$. Therefore the conditions of Lemma 1(b) hold, implying that $\lim_{k\to\infty} u_k = 0$. Thus, the result (a) follows.

(b) Note that the variance of x_k may be bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}ar(x_k) &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\big\| \mathbb{E}[x_k] - x_k \big\|^2 \Big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[\big\| \mathbb{E}[x_k - x^*] - (x_k - x^*) \big\|^2 \Big] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\big[\|x_k - x^*\|^2 \big] - \big\| \mathbb{E}[x_k - x^*] \big\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\big[\|x_k - x^*\|^2 \big]. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

From Assumption 1(a), recall that D_{X_i} is defined as:

$$D_{X_i} = \sup\{d(x_i, x_i') : x_i, x_i' \in X_i\}. \tag{18}$$

Then by (10), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\|x_{i,k+1} - x_i^*\|^2 &\leq \|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2 + \|\widehat{x}_i(y_k) - \widehat{x}_i(x^*)\|^2 + 2\|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|\|\widehat{x}_i(y_k) - \widehat{x}_i(x^*)\| \\ &\leq \|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2 + \|\widehat{x}_i(y_k) - \widehat{x}_i(x^*)\|^2 + 2D_{X_i}\|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|,\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^N \|x_{i,k+1} - x_i^*\|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \|\widehat{x}_i(y_k) - \widehat{x}_i(x^*)\|^2 + 2\sum_{i=1}^N D_{X_i}\|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|. \qquad (19) \\ &\overset{(11)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^N \|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2 + a^2\sum_{i=1}^N \|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2 + 2\sum_{i=1}^N D_{X_i}\|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|.\end{aligned}$$

By (8) and conditional Jensen's inequality we have that for any k and $i \in \mathcal{N}$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\| \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_k\right] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k\right]} \leq \alpha_{i,k} \;\; a.s.$$

Thus, by taking expectations on both sides of (19), from (8) we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|^2|] \leq a^2\mathbb{E}[\|x_k - x^*\|^2] + \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_{i,k}^2 + 2\sum_{i=1}^N D_{X_i}\alpha_{i,k} \;\; a.s. \tag{20}$$

Since $\lim_{k\to\infty} \alpha_{i,k} = 0$, by applying Lemma 1(b) we have that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|^2|] = 0$. Thus, the result (b) follows by invoking (17) . □

3.3 Rate of convergence

We begin with a supporting lemma that bounds a sub-linear rate by a prescribed linear rate. This has been recently proven in the following dissertation [32].

Lemma 2 *Given a function zc^z with $0 < c < 1$. Then for all $z \geq 0$, we have that*

$$zc^z < Dq^z, \text{ where } c < q < 1 \text{ and } D > \frac{1}{\ln(q/c)^e}.$$

Proof. Consider a function Dq^z where $D > 0$ and $0 < q < 1$. Then zc^z cannot be bounded by Dq^z if $Dq^z - zc^z$ has a real positive root. Specifically, we have that any root has to satisfy

$$h(z) = \ln(D) + z\ln(q/c) - \ln(z) = 0.$$

We note that $h'(z) = \ln(q/c) - 1/z$, $h''(z) = 1/z^2 > 0$ for $z \in [0, \infty)$ implying that h is a convex function. Furthermore, $h(0) = +\infty$ and the minimizer $z^{\min} \in (0, \infty)$ where $h'(z^{\min}) = 0$ or

$$+\ln(q/c) = 1/z^{\min} \implies z^{\min} = 1/\ln(q/c).$$

If $q > c$, then $z^{\min} > 0$ and $h(z^{\min})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} h(z^{\min}) &= \ln(D) + \frac{1}{\ln(q/c)} \ln(q/c) - \ln(1/\ln(q/c)) \\ &= 1 + \ln(D) + \ln(\ln(q/c)). \end{aligned}$$

It suffices that $h(z^{\min}) > 0$ since the function $h(z)$ increases in z for $z \geq z^{\min}$ and there can be no real root. Consequently, if $1 > q > c$ and D is chosen such that $\ln(D) > -1 - \ln(\ln(q/c)$, then $Dq^z = zc^z$ does not have a root. Equivalently, we have that

$$D > e^{-1-\ln(\ln(q/c))} = \frac{1}{e} \left(\ln(q/c)\right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{\ln(q/c)^e}.$$

Since $h(0) > 0$, it follows that $h(z) > 0$ for all $z \geq 0$. □

Proposition 4 (Geometric rate of convergence) *Consider the synchronous inexact proximal best-response scheme (Algorithm 1) where $\mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,0} - x_i^*\|] \leq C$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, and that $\alpha_{i,k} = \eta_i^{k+1}$ with $\eta_i \in (0,1)$. Then, the following holds for $k \geq 0$:*

$$u_k \leq \sqrt{N}(C + D)q^k, \tag{21}$$

where u_k is defined in (15)*, $c \triangleq \max\{a, \eta\}, \eta \triangleq \max_i \eta_i, q > c$, and $D \triangleq 1/\ln((q/c)^e)$.*

Proof. Since $\alpha_{i,k} = \eta_i^{k+1}$ where η_i is a scalar in $(0,1)$, by (16) we have the following sequence of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} u_k &\leq a u_{k-1} + \sqrt{N}\eta^k \\ &\leq a^2 u_{k-2} + \sqrt{N} a \eta^{k-1} + \sqrt{N}\eta^k \\ &\vdots \\ &\leq a^k u_0 + \sqrt{N} \sum_{j=1}^{k} a^{k-j}\eta^j \\ &\leq c^k u_0 + \sqrt{N} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} c^k \right) = (u_0 + \sqrt{N}k)c^k, \end{aligned}$$

where $c \triangleq \max\{a, \eta\}$. From Lemma 2, there exist scalars q and D satisfying $q \in (c, 1)$ and $D \geq 1/\ln((q/c)^e)$ such that $kc^k \leq Dq^k$, and hence

$$(u_0 + \sqrt{N}k)c^k \leq (u_0 + \sqrt{N}D)q^k.$$

Since $u_0 \leq \sqrt{N}C$ by $\mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,0} - x_i^*\|] \leq C \; \forall i = 1, \ldots, N$, it follows that $u_k \leq \sqrt{N}(C + D)q^k$. □

Remark 2 *This is a somewhat surprising result in that if the inexactness is driven to zero at a suitable rate, there is* **no** *degradation in the overall rate of convergence; in effect, the rate stays linear and can be precisely specified. Notably, the impact of the number of players on the rate appears only in terms of the constant.*

3.4 Overall iteration complexity analysis

We now utilize the results from the prior subsection to develop overall iteration complexity bounds. Recall that under the prescribed setting, the regularized variant, as prescribed by (7), is always strongly convex with parameter μ. Given the strong convexity of each player's objective function, stochastic approximation schemes provide an avenue for obtaining an inexact solution. In such a scheme, at the major iteration k, given y_k the ith player takes the following sequence of *stochastic* gradient steps from $t = 1, \ldots, j_{i,k}$, where $j_{i,k}$ steps suffice in obtaining an inexact solution of accuracy $\alpha_{i,k}$:

$$z_{i,t+1} := \Pi_{X_i}\left[z_{i,t} - \gamma_t \underbrace{\left(\nabla_{x_i}\psi_i(z_{i,t}, y_{-i,k}; \xi_{i,k}^t) + \mu(z_{i,t} - y_{i,k})\right)}_{\triangleq G_i(z_{i,t}, y_k, \xi_{i,k}^t)}\right], \tag{SA$_{i,k}$}$$

where $z_{i,1} = x_{i,k}$, and $\gamma_t = 1/\mu(t+1)$. Note that $\nabla_{x_i}\psi_i(z_{i,t}, y_{-i,k}; \xi_{i,k}^t)$ denotes the sample gradient of $f_i(\cdot)$ at point $(z_{i,t}, x_{-i,k})$ while γ_t is a non-summable but square summable sequence.

Let the stochastic approximation scheme (SA$_{i,k}$) from $t = 1, \ldots, j_{i,k}$ be employed for obtaining $x_{i,k+1}$. Define $\xi_{i,k} = (\xi_{i,k}^1, \cdots, \xi_{i,k}^{j_{i,k}})$, and $\mathcal{F}_k = \sigma\{x_0, \xi_{i,l}, i \in \mathcal{N}, 0 \leq l \leq k-1\}$. Then by Algorithm 1, we see that x_k is adapted to $\mathcal{F}_k$, and $\widehat{x}_i(y_k)$ is also adapted to $\mathcal{F}_k$ since $\widehat{x}_i(y_k) = \widehat{x}_i(x_k)$ is an optimal solution to the parameterized problem (7). We derive error bounds as specified by the following lemma similar to that given in [25, Eq. 5.292].

Lemma 3 *Let Assumption 1 hold. Consider the synchronous inexact proximal best-response scheme given by Algorithm 1. Assume that the random variables $\{\xi_{i,k}^t\}_{1 \leq t \leq j_{i,k}}$ are independent and identically distributed, and in addition, that for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$ the random vector $\xi_{i,k}$ is independent of $\mathcal{F}_k$. Then for any $t \geq 1$ we have $\mathbb{E}\left[\|z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_k\right] \leq Q_i/(t+1)$ a.s., where $Q_i \triangleq \frac{2M_i^2}{\mu^2} + 2D_{X_i}^2$.*

Proof. Set $A_t = \|z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2$ and $a_t = \mathbb{E}\left[A_t \big| \mathcal{F}_k\right]$. Since X_i is a convex set and $\widehat{x}_i(y_k) \in X_i$, from algorithm (SA$_{i,k}$) by the nonexpansive property of the projection operator we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{t+1} &= \left\|\Pi_{X_i}\left[z_{i,t} - \gamma_t G_i(z_{i,t}, y_k, \xi_{i,k}^t)\right] - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\right\|^2 \\ &\leq \left\|z_{i,t} - \gamma_t G_i(z_{i,t}, y_k, \xi_{i,k}^t) - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\right\|^2 \\ &\leq A_t + \gamma_t^2 \|G_i(z_{i,t}, y_k, \xi_{i,k}^t)\|^2 - 2\gamma_t \left(z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\right)^T G_i(z_{i,t}, y_k, \xi_{i,k}^t). \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Since x_k is adapted to $\mathcal{F}_k$, by (SA$_{i,k}$) it is seen that $z_{i,t}$ is adapted to $\sigma\{\mathcal{F}_k, \xi_{i,k}^{[t-1]}\}$, where $\xi_{i,k}^{[t]} = (\xi_{i,k}^1, \cdots, \xi_{i,k}^t)$. Then by the tower property of conditional expectation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\right)^T G_i(z_{i,t}, y_k, \xi_{i,k}^t) \big| \mathcal{F}_k\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\left(z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\right)^T G_i(z_{i,t}, y_k, \xi_{i,k}^t) \big| \sigma\{\mathcal{F}_k, \xi_{i,k}^{[t-1]}\}\right] \Big| \mathcal{F}_k\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\right)^T \mathbb{E}\left[G_i(z_{i,t}, y_k, \xi_{i,k}^t) \big| \sigma\{\mathcal{F}_k, \xi_{i,k}^{[t-1]}\}\right] \Big| \mathcal{F}_k\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $z_{i,t}, y_k$ are adapted to $\sigma\{\mathcal{F}_k, \xi_{i,k}^{[t-1]}\}$ while $\xi_{i,k}^t$ is independent of $\sigma\{\mathcal{F}_k, \xi_{i,k}^{[t-1]}\}$, from [33, Corollary 7.1.2], by Assumption 1(c) and $G_i(z_{i,t}, y_k, \xi_{i,k}^t)$ defined in (SA$_{i,k}$), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[G_i(z_{i,t}, y_k, \xi_{i,k}^t) \big| \sigma\{\mathcal{F}_k, \xi_{i,k}^{[t-1]}\}\right] = \nabla_{x_i} f_i(z_{i,t}, y_{-i,k}) + \mu(z_{i,t} - y_{i,k}) \ \ a.s., \tag{23}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\left(z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\right)^T G_i(z_{i,t}, y_k, \xi_{i,k}^t) \big| \mathcal{F}_k\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\right)^T \left(\nabla_{x_i} f_i(z_{i,t}, y_{-i,k}) + \mu(z_{i,t} - y_{i,k})\right) \Big| \mathcal{F}_k\right] \ \ a.s. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Note that $\tilde{f}_i(x_i) = f_i(x_i, y_{-i,k}) + \frac{\mu}{2}\|x_i - y_{i,k}\|^2$ is strongly convex with parameter μ and $\widehat{x}_i(y_k)$ denotes the optimal solution of $\min_{x_i \in X_i} \tilde{f}_i(x_i)$. Then by $z_{i,t} \in X_i$, we may conclude that for any $t = 1, \cdots, j_{i,k}$:

$$\begin{aligned} &(z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k))^T \nabla \tilde{f}_i(\widehat{x}_i(y_k)) \geq 0, \\ \text{and} \quad &(z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k))^T \left(\nabla \tilde{f}_i(z_{i,t}) - \nabla \tilde{f}_i(\widehat{x}_i(y_k))\right) \geq \mu \|z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2 = \mu A_t. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by adding the two inequalities we obtain the following:

$$(z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k))^T \left(\nabla_{x_i} f_i(z_{i,t}, y_{-i,k}) + \mu(z_{i,t} - y_{i,k})\right) = (z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k))^T \nabla \tilde{f}_i(z_{i,t}) \geq \mu A_t,$$

which after taking conditional expectations and invoking (24), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k))^T G_i(z_{i,t}, y_k, \xi^t_{i,k}) \big| \mathcal{F}_k\right] \geq \mu \mathbb{E}\left[A_t \big| \mathcal{F}_k\right] = \mu a_t \ \ a.s. \tag{25}$$

Since

$$\|G_i(z_{i,t}, y_k, \xi^t_{i,k})\|^2 \leq 2\|\nabla_{x_i} \psi_i(z_{i,t}, x_{-i,k}; \xi^t_{i,k})\|^2 + 2\|\mu(z_{i,t} - y_{i,k})\|^2,$$

by Assumption 1(d) and (18), similar to (23) we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|G_i(z_{i,t}, y_k, \xi^t_{i,k})\|^2 \big| \sigma\{\mathcal{F}_k, \xi^{[t-1]}_{i,k}\}\right] \leq 2M_i^2 + 2\|\mu(z_{i,t} - y_{i,k})\|^2 \leq 2(M_i^2 + \mu^2 D_{X_i}^2) \ \ a.s.$$

Then by the tower property of conditional expectations we obtain the following:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|G_i(z_{i,t}, y_k, \xi^t_{i,k})\|^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_k\right] \leq 2(M_i^2 + \mu^2 D_{X_i}^2) \ \ a.s. \tag{26}$$

By taking expectations conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_k$ on both sides of (22), from (25) and (26) we have

$$a_{t+1} \leq (1 - 2\mu\gamma_t) a_t + 2(M_i^2 + \mu^2 D_{X_i}^2)\gamma_t^2 \ \ a.s.$$

By substituting $\gamma_t = \frac{1}{\mu(t+1)}$ we obtain $a_{t+1} \leq (1 - \frac{2}{t+1})a_t + \frac{Q_i}{(t+1)^2} \ \ a.s.$, where $Q_i \triangleq \frac{2M_i^2}{\mu^2} + 2D_{X_i}^2$.

We inductively prove that for any $t \geq 1$, $a_t \leq \frac{Q_i}{(t+1)} \ a.s.$ By (18) we have that $A_1 \leq D_{X_i}^2$, and hence $a_1 \leq \frac{Q_i}{2}$. Suppose that $a_t \leq \frac{Q_i}{(t+1)} \ a.s.$ holds for some $t \geq 1$. It remains to show that $a_{t+1} \leq \frac{Q_i}{(t+2)} \ a.s.$ Note that

$$a_{t+1} \leq (1 - \frac{2}{t+1})\frac{Q_i}{(t+1)} + \frac{Q_i}{(t+1)^2} = Q_i \frac{t-1}{(t+1)^2} \leq Q_i \frac{1}{t+2} \ \ a.s.,$$

where the last inequality holds by the fact that $(t-1)(t+2) \leq (t+1)^2$. Consequently, we conclude that $a_t \leq \frac{Q_i}{(t+1)} \ a.s.$ for any $t \geq 1$, and hence the lemma follows. □

To address strategies that are approximately a Nash equilibrium, we use the concept of $\epsilon-$Nash equilibrium. A random strategy profile $x : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is an $\epsilon-$Nash equilibrium if that

$$\mathbb{E}\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|x_1 - x_1^*\| \\ \vdots \\ \|x_N - x_N^*\| \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq \epsilon. \tag{27}$$

In what follows, we provide an explicit bound on the overall iteration complexity for the synchronous inexact proximal best-response scheme.

Theorem 1 (Overall iteration complexity) *Let Algorithm 1 be applied to the $N-$player stochastic Nash game (SNash), where $\alpha_{i,k} = \eta^{k+1}$ for some $\eta \in (0,1)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,0} - x_i^*\|^2] \leq C^2 \ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$. Assume that an inexact solution to the proximal best-response problem is computed via a stochastic approximation scheme given by*

(SA$_{i,k}$). *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Then the number of projected gradient steps for player i to compute an $\epsilon-$Nash equilibrium is no greater than*

$$\ell_i(\eta) \triangleq \frac{Q_i}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{\sqrt{N}(C+D)}{\epsilon} \right)^{\frac{\ln(1/\eta^2)}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))}} + \left\lceil \frac{\ln\left(\sqrt{N}(C+D)/\epsilon\right)}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))} \right\rceil, \tag{28}$$

where $Q_i \triangleq \frac{2M_i^2}{\mu^2} + 2D_{X_i}^2$, $q(a,\eta) > c = \max\{a,\eta\}$ *with* $a = \|\Gamma\|$, *and* $D = 1/\ln((q/c)^e)$.

Proof. Suppose that $j_{i,k} = \left\lceil \frac{Q_i}{\eta^{2(k+1)}} \right\rceil$ steps of the stochastic approximation scheme (SA$_{i,k}$) are taken at major iteration k to obtain $x_{i,k+1}$, i.e., $x_{i,k+1} = z_{i,j_{i,k}}$. Then by Lemma 3 and $j_{i,k} \geq \frac{Q_i}{\eta^{2(k+1)}}$, we see that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_k\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\|z_{i,j_{i,k}} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_k\right] \leq \frac{Q_i}{j_{i,k}} \leq \eta^{2(k+1)} = \alpha_{i,k}^2 \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}.$$

Based on (21), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} u_{k+1} \leq \sqrt{N}(C+D)q^{k+1} \leq \epsilon \Rightarrow\ & q^{k+1} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{N}(C+D)} \triangleq \bar{\epsilon} \\ \Rightarrow\ & k \geq \frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q)} - 1. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

By recalling that for $\beta > 1$, we have that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta^k \leq \int_1^{K+1} \beta^x dx \leq \frac{\beta^{K+1}}{\ln(\beta)}, \tag{30}$$

which together with the requirement that $1 > q(a,\eta) = \max(a,\eta) + \upsilon > \max\{a,\eta\}$, allows us to bound the overall iteration complexity of player i as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))} \right\rceil - 1} j_{i,k} &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))} \right\rceil - 1} \left(1 + \frac{Q_i}{\eta^{2(k+1)}}\right) = \sum_{k=1}^{\left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))} \right\rceil} \frac{Q_i}{\eta^{2k}} + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))} \right\rceil \\ &\leq \frac{Q_i}{\ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\eta^{2\left(\frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))}+2\right)}} \right) + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))} \right\rceil. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\eta^{2\frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))}} = \left(e^{\ln(\eta^2)}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))}} = e^{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon}))^{\frac{\ln(\eta^2)}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))}}} = (1/\bar{\epsilon})^{\frac{\ln(\eta^2)}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))}}.$$

Therefore, the overall iteration complexity of player i is bounded by the following:

$$\frac{Q_i}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\bar{\epsilon}}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1/\eta^2)}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))}} + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))} \right\rceil.$$

Then the result follows from recalling the definition of $\bar{\epsilon}$ in (29). □

We now examine whether the upper bound given by (28) can be optimized further and the effort can be bounded. Note that this does not provide a lower bound on the overall iteration complexity but merely bounds the expression (28) from below to display tightness of the bound.

Proposition 5 (Bounds on complexity) *Let the synchronous inexact proximal best-response scheme (Algorithm 1) be applied to the $N-$player stochastic Nash game (SNash), where $\alpha_{i,k} = \eta^{k+1}\ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$ for some $\eta \in (0,1)$. Suppose an inexact solution to the best-response problem is computed via a stochastic approximation scheme given by* ($\mathrm{SA}_{i,k}$)*. Assume that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Suppose $Q_i \triangleq \frac{2M_i^2}{\mu^2} + 2D_{X_i}^2$, $\mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,0} - x_i^*\|^2] \leq C^2$, and $a = \|\Gamma\|$. Then the following hold:*

(a) For a given $\eta \in (0,1)$, the complexity in terms of gradient steps for player i to obtain an ϵ-Nash equilibrium is no worse than $\ell_i(\eta)$ steps, where $q(a,\eta) > c = \max\{a,\eta\}$, and $D = 1/\ln((q/c)^e)$.

(b) Further, $\ell_i(\eta) = \Omega(1/\bar{\epsilon}^2)$, where $\bar{\epsilon}$ is defined by (29)*.*

(c) If $\eta = a$, then given any $\delta > 0$, $\ell_i(a)$ satisfies the following upper bound:

$$\ell_i(a) \leq \frac{Q_i}{a^4 \ln(1/a^2)} \left(\frac{\sqrt{N}(C+D)}{\epsilon} \right)^{2+\delta} + \left\lceil \ln\left(\frac{\sqrt{N}(C+D)}{\epsilon} \right) \frac{2+\delta}{2\ln(a^{-1})} \right\rceil,$$

where $D = \frac{1+2\delta^{-1}}{e\ln(a^{-1})}$.

Proof. (a). This follows from Theorem 1.

(b). We consider two cases based on where $\eta > a$ and $\eta \leq a$:

Case 1. ($\eta > a$): Then $q = \eta + \upsilon$, implying that the overall complexity of player i is bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell_i(\eta) &> \frac{Q_i}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\bar{\epsilon}}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1/\eta^2)}{\ln(1/(\eta+\upsilon))}} \\
&> \frac{Q_i}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\bar{\epsilon}}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1/\eta^2)}{\ln(1/\eta)}} \qquad \left(\text{since } \tfrac{1}{\ln(1/(\eta+\upsilon))} > \tfrac{1}{\ln(1/\eta)}\right) \\
&= \frac{Q_i}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\bar{\epsilon}^2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\ell_i(\eta) = \Omega(1/\bar{\epsilon}^2)$.

Case 2. ($\eta \leq a$): Then $q = a + \upsilon$, implying that the overall complexity of player i is bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell_i(\eta) &> \frac{Q_i}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\bar{\epsilon}}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1/\eta^2)}{\ln(1/(a+\upsilon))}} \\
&\geq \frac{Q_i}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\bar{\epsilon}}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1/a^2)}{\ln(1/(a+\upsilon))}} \qquad \left(\text{since } \ln(1/\eta^2) \geq \ln(1/a^2)\right) \\
&\geq \frac{Q_i}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\bar{\epsilon}}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1/(a+\upsilon)^2)}{\ln(1/(a+\upsilon))}} \qquad \left(\text{since } \ln(1/a^2) \geq \ln(1/(a+\upsilon)^2)\right) \\
&= \frac{Q_i}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\bar{\epsilon}^2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\ell_i(\eta) = \Omega(1/\bar{\epsilon}^2)$.

(c). Define $q(a,\eta) = ce^{\delta_0/2}$, where $\delta_0 = \frac{\delta \ln(a^{-1})}{1+\delta/2}$. Since $c = a$ by $\eta = a$, we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\ln(1/q(a,\eta)) = \ln(a^{-1}) - \delta_0/2 = \frac{2\ln(a^{-1})}{2+\delta}, \\
&\frac{\ln(1/\eta^2)}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))} = \frac{2\ln(a^{-1})}{\ln(1/q(a,\eta))} = 2 + \frac{\delta_0}{\frac{\ln(a^{-1})}{1+\delta/2}} = 2+\delta, \\
&\text{and} \quad D = 1/\ln((q/c)^e) = 1/\ln(e^{\delta_0 e/2}) = \frac{2}{\delta_0 e} = \frac{1+2\delta^{-1}}{e\ln(a^{-1})}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by the expression $\ell_i(\eta)$ defined in (28), we may derive result (c) when η is chosen to be a. $\square$

Remark 3 *Several points need reinforcement in light of the obtained complexity statements:*
(i) *First, the iteration complexity bound grows slowly in the number of players, a desirable feature of any distributed algorithm employed for games with a large collection of agents.*
(ii) *Second, when $N = 1$, the complexity bound reduces to $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{2+\delta})$ gradient steps which is effectively the complexity bound for standard stochastic convex optimization problems suggesting that these bounds may well be optimal.*
(iii) *Third, in an effort to examine the tightness of the bound, we show that our bound on the iteration complexity is bounded from below by a term that is of the order of N/ϵ^2. Note this is not a lower bound on the complexity itself which we leave as future research.*

Corollary 1 *Let Algorithm 1 be applied to the $N-$player stochastic Nash game (SNash), where $\alpha_{i,k} = \eta^{k+1}$ for some $\eta \in (a, 1)$, and an inexact proximal best-response solution satisfying* (8) *be computed via the stochastic approximation scheme* ($\text{SA}_{i,k}$). *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Then the number of projected gradient steps for player i to compute an $\epsilon-$Nash equilibrium is no greater than*

$$\frac{Q_i}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{\sqrt{N}(C + \frac{\eta}{\eta - a})}{\epsilon} \right)^2 + \left\lceil \frac{\ln\left(\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\epsilon} \left(C + \frac{\eta}{\eta - a} \right) \right)}{\ln(1/\eta)} \right\rceil,$$

where $Q_i \triangleq \frac{2M_i^2}{\mu^2} + 2D_{X_i}^2$, $\mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,0} - x_i^*\|^2] \leq C^2$, and $a = \|\Gamma\|$.

Proof. By (16) we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} u_k &\leq a u_{k-1} + \sqrt{N}\eta^k \\ &\vdots \\ &\leq a^k u_0 + \sqrt{N} \sum_{j=1}^{k} a^{k-j} \eta^j. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{a}{\eta} \in (0, 1)$ by $\eta \in (a, 1)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{k} a^{k-j} \eta^j = \eta^k \sum_{j=1}^{k} a^{k-j} \eta^{j-k} = \eta^k \sum_{j=1}^{k} (a/\eta)^{k-j} = \eta^k \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (a/\eta)^j \\ \leq \frac{1 - (a/\eta)^k}{1 - a/\eta} \eta^k = \frac{\eta^k - a^k}{1 - a/\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by $u_0 \leq \sqrt{N}C$ and $a < \eta$ we obtain the following bound:

$$u_k \leq \sqrt{N} C a^k + \frac{\sqrt{N}\eta}{\eta - a}(\eta^k - a^k) \leq \left(\sqrt{N}C + \frac{\sqrt{N}\eta}{\eta - a} \right) \eta^k.$$

Thus, by setting $\bar{k} = \frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\eta)}$ with $\bar{\epsilon} = \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{N}(C + 1/(\eta - a))}$ we have the following:

$$u_{k+1} \leq \epsilon \ \ \forall k \geq \bar{k} - 1.$$

Suppose that $j_{i,k} = \left\lceil \frac{Q_i}{\eta^{2(k+1)}} \right\rceil$ stochastic gradient steps ($\text{SA}_{i,k}$) are taken at major iteration k to obtain $x_{i,k+1}$. Then by Lemma 3, it is seen that for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_k \right] \leq \alpha_{i,k}^2.$$

By invoking that (30) holds for $\beta > 1$, we may bound the overall iteration complexity of player i as follows:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\eta)} \right\rceil - 1} j_{i,k} = \sum_{k=1}^{\left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\eta)} \right\rceil} \frac{Q_i}{\eta^{2k}} + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\eta)} \right\rceil \leq \frac{Q_i}{\ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\eta^{2\left(\frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\eta)}+2\right)}} \right) + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\eta)} \right\rceil$$
$$= \frac{Q_i}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} (1/\bar{\epsilon})^2 + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\eta)} \right\rceil.$$

Thus, the result follows by $\bar{\epsilon} = \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{N}(C+1/(\eta-a))}$, and hence the overall complexity is of $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$. □

Remark 4 *It seems that Corollary 1 gives better results than those of Theorem 1 and Proposition 5 since it shows that the iteration complexity is exactly of $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ instead of $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{2+\delta})$. However, Corollary 1 restricts the parameter η to be $\eta \in (a, 1)$ while Theorem 1 provides more flexibility on the selection of η only by requiring $\eta \in (0, 1)$. As a matter of fact, the numerical results (Table 3) in Section 7 indicates that smaller $\eta \in (0, 1)$ may give better empirical iteration complexity. In the following two sections we establish the overall iteration complexity for the randomized and the asynchronous algorithms through the same path of Theorem 1 and Proposition 5.*

4 A Randomized Inexact Proximal Best-response Algorithm

In this section, we propose a randomized inexact proximal best-response algorithm, where a subset of players is randomly chosen to update their strategies in each major iteration, and the inexact proximal best-response solutions are achieved via the stochastic approximation scheme.

4.1 Algorithm Description

The random block coordinate descent method is proposed in [26] to solve huge scale optimization problems, where the coordinates are partitioned into several blocks and at each iteration only one block of variables is randomly chosen to update while the other blocks keep invariant. Subsequently, the convergence is analyzed for both the convex and nonconvex optimization problem [26, 34, 35]. Recently, the method is generalized to the fixed point problem [27], in which a subset of block variables is randomly chosen to update in each iteration according to some binary variables. Motivated by those existing works, we design a randomized inexact proximal best-response scheme as follows: For any $i \in \mathcal{N}$, let $\{\chi_{i,k}\}_{k\geq 0}$ be a sequence of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) binary random variables taking values in $\{0, 1\}$. The binary variable $\chi_{i,k}$ signals whether the ith player updates at major iteration k. If $\chi_{i,k} = 1$, then player i initiates an update at major iteration k and computes an inexact proximal best-response solution satisfying (31), where $\mathcal{F}_k$ is the σ-field of the entire information used by the algorithm up to (and including) the update of x_k, and $\alpha_{i,k}$ is a nonnegative random variable adapted to $\mathcal{F}_k$. It is worth noticing that $\mathcal{F}_k$ contains the sample implementation of $\chi_{i,l}$ for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $l : 0 \leq l \leq k-1$, and $\alpha_{i,k}$ may also depend on the sample implementation of $\{\chi_{i,l}\}_{0\leq l\leq k-1}$. We will define $\mathcal{F}_k$ in Section 4.4, and specify the selection of the sequence $\{\alpha_{i,k}\}_{k\geq 0}$ when we proceed to investigate the convergence properties.

Algorithm 2 Randomized inexact proximal best-response scheme

Let $k := 0$, $y_{i,0} = x_{i,0} \in X_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

(1) If $\chi_{i,k} = 1$, then $x_{i,k+1}$ is defined as follows:

$$x_{i,k+1} \in \left\{ z \in X_i : \mathbb{E}\left[\|z - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_k \right] \leq \alpha_{i,k}^2 \ \ a.s. \right\}, \tag{31}$$

where $\widehat{x}_i(y_k)$ is defined in (7). Otherwise, $x_{i,k+1} = x_{i,k}$ when $\chi_{i,k} = 0$.

(2) For $i = 1, \ldots, N$, $y_{i,k+1} := x_{i,k+1}$;

(3) $k := k + 1$; If $k < K$, return to (1); else STOP.

We need the following condition in the convergence analysis.

Assumption 3 *For any $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $\mathbb{P}(\chi_{i,k} = 1) = p_i > 0$ and $\chi_{i,k}$ is independent of $\mathcal{F}_k$.*

Remark 5 *We make the following clarifications on Assumption 3:*
(i) *The condition $\mathbb{P}(\chi_{i,k} = 1) = p_i > 0$ guarantees that each player initiates an update with positive probability at major iteration k of Algorithm 2. It accommodates the special case where only one player is randomly chosen with positive probility to update in each iteration.*
(ii) *The Poisson model [36, 37] is a special case: Each player $i \in \mathcal{N}$ is activated according to a local Poisson clock, which ticks according to a rate $\varrho_i > 0$ Poisson process. Suppose that there is a virtual global clock which ticks whenever any of the local Poisson clocks tick. Assume that the local Poisson clocks are independent, then the global clock ticks according to a Poisson process with rate $\sum_{i=1}^N \varrho_i$. Let Z_k denote the time of the k-th tick of the global clock, and $I_k \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$ denote the set of players whose clocks tick at time Z_k. Since the local Poisson clocks are independent, with probability one, I_k contains a single element and $\mathbb{P}(I_k = i) = \frac{\varrho_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \varrho_i} \triangleq p_i$. Besides, the memoryless property of the Poisson process indicates that the process $\{I_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ is i.i.d. As a result, the processes $\{\chi_{i,k}\}$ $\forall i \in \mathcal{N}$ are mutually independent and for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $\{\chi_{i,k}\}$ is an i.i.d sequence with $\mathbb{P}(\chi_{i,k} = 1) = p_i > 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^N p_i = 1$.*

4.2 Almost Sure Convergence

Lemma 4 *Let the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ be generated by Algorithm 2. Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold, and that for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $0 \leq \alpha_{i,k} < 1$ and $\sum_{k=0}^\infty \alpha_{i,k} < \infty$ a.s. Then for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$,*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} x_{i,k} = x_i^* \ \ a.s.$$

Proof. Define $t_{i,k} \triangleq x_{i,k} + \chi_{i,k}(\widehat{x}_i(x_k) - x_{i,k})$, and $e_{i,k} \triangleq \chi_{i,k}\left(x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(x_k)\right)$. Then $x_{i,k+1} = t_{i,k} + e_{i,k}$. By Assumption 3 we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|t_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_k \right] = (1 - p_i)\|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2 + p_i \|\widehat{x}_i(x_k) - x_i^*\|^2.$$

For any $x = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N \in X$, define $|||x|||^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{p_i}\|x_i\|^2$. Then by denoting $t_k = \{t_{i,k}\}_{i=1}^N$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[|||t_k - x^*|||^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_k \right] &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{p_i} \mathbb{E}\left[\|t_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_k \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{p_i}(1 - p_i)\|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{p_i} p_i \|\widehat{x}_i(x_k) - x_i^*\|^2 \\
&= |||x_k - x^*|||^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \|\widehat{x}_i(x_k) - x_i^*\|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^N \|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by $\widehat{x}(x^*) = x^*$ and inequality (9), we have the following inequality:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\widehat{x}_i(x_k) - x_i^*\|^2 \leq a^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2,$$

and hence we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|||t_k - x^*|||^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k\right] \leq |||x_k - x^*|||^2 - (1-a^2) \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2. \tag{32}$$

By (31) and Assumption 3 we see that for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|e_{i,k}\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k\right] = p_i \mathbb{E}\left[\|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(x_k)\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k\right] \leq p_i \alpha_{i,k}^2 \ \ a.s., \tag{33}$$

and hence we obtain the following:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|||e_k|||^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k\right] \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_{i,k}^2 \ \ a.s. \tag{34}$$

Note that by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\|x_{i,k+1} - x_i^*\|^2 \leq \|t_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2 + \|e_{i,k}\|^2 + 2\|t_{i,k} - x_i^*\|\|e_{i,k}\|.$$

Then by Hölder's inequality, we obtain the following

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|x_{i,k+1} - x_i^*\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\|t_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\|e_{i,k}\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k\right] + 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\|t_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k\right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\|e_{i,k}\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k\right]}.$$

Since $t_{i,k} \in X_i$, by (18) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[|||x_{k+1} - x^*|||^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[|||t_k - x^*|||^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k\right] + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\left[|||e_k|||^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k\right] + 2\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\|e_{i,k}\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k\right]} \frac{D_{X_i}}{p_i} \\ &\leq |||x_k - x^*|||^2 - (1-a^2) \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_{i,k}^2 + 2\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{D_{X_i}}{\sqrt{p_i}} \alpha_{i,k}, \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where the last inequality is derived by (32), (33), and (34). Since $0 \leq \alpha_{i,k} < 1$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{i,k} < \infty \ a.s.$, we have the following for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{i,k}^2 < \infty \ \ a.s.$$

Then by the Robbins-Siegmund theorem ([38, Theorem 1]), $|||x_k - x^*|||^2$ converges almost surely and

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (1-a^2) \ \|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2 < \infty \ \ a.s.$$

Consequently, $\|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2 \ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$ converges to zero almost surely, and the result follows. □

4.3 Rate of Convergence

Define $\beta_{i,0} = 0$ and $\beta_{i,k} = \sum_{p=0}^{k-1} \chi_{i,p}$ for all $k \geq 1$. Thus, $\beta_{i,k}$ is adapted to $\mathcal{F}_k$. Note that for the Poisson model described in Remark 5, players may not able to know the exact number of ticks of the global clock. Then it is impractical to set $\alpha_{i,k}$ be a function of k, instead, a function of $\beta_{i,k}$ is appropriate.

Lemma 5 (Geometric Convergence) *Let the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ be generated by Algorithm 2, where $\alpha_{i,k} = \eta^{\beta_{i,k}+1}$ for some $\eta \in (0,1)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,0} - x_i^*\|] \leq C\ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$. Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold. Then the following holds for $k \geq 0$*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|||x_k - x^*|||\right] \leq \sqrt{N}(\widetilde{C} + \tilde{D})\tilde{q}^k,$$

where $\tilde{c} \triangleq \max\{\tilde{a}, \tilde{\eta}\}$ with $\tilde{a}$ and $\tilde{\eta}$ defined by (36) *and* (38)*, respectively, $\tilde{q} > \tilde{c}$, $D \triangleq 1/\ln((\tilde{q}/\tilde{c})^e)$, $\widetilde{C} = C\left(\sum_{i=1}^N N^{-1}p_i^{-1}\right)^{1/2}$, and $\widetilde{D} = D\eta\tilde{\eta}^{-1}$.*

Proof. Note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{p_i}{p_i}\|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2 \geq p_{\min}\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{p_i}\|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2 = p_{\min}|||x_k - x^*|||^2,$$

where $p_{\min} = \min_{i\in\mathcal{N}} p_i$. Then by (32), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[|||t_k - x^*|||^2\big|\mathcal{F}_k\right] &\leq |||x_k - x^*|||^2 - (1-a^2)\sum_{i=1}^N \|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2 \\ &\leq \underbrace{\left(1 - p_{\min}(1-a^2)\right)}_{\triangleq \tilde{a}^2}|||x_k - x^*|||^2\ \ a.s,\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

and hence by the conditional Jensen's inequality, we obtain the following bound:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|||t_k - x^*|||\big|\mathcal{F}_k\right] \leq \tilde{a}|||x_k - x^*|||\ \ a.s.$$

Then from $x_{k+1} = t_k + e_k$, the triangle inequality and Jensen's inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[|||x_{k+1} - x^*|||\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[|||t_k - x^*|||\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[|||e_k|||\right] \\ &\leq \tilde{a}\mathbb{E}\left[|||x_k - x^*|||\right] + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[|||e_k|||^2\right]}.\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(\beta_{i,k} = m) = \binom{k}{m} p_i^m(1-p_i)^{k-m}$ for all $k \geq 1$. Then for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\eta^{2\beta_{i,k}}] &= \sum_{m=0}^k \eta^{2m}\mathbb{P}(\beta_{i,k} = m) = \sum_{m=0}^k \binom{k}{m} p_i^m(1-p_i)^{k-m}\eta^{2m} \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^k \binom{k}{m}(p_i\eta^2)^m(1-p_i)^{k-m} = (p_i\eta^2 + 1 - p_i)^k \\ &= (1 - p_i(1-\eta^2))^k \leq (1 - p_{\min}(1-\eta^2))^k \triangleq \tilde{\eta}^{2k}\ \ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}.\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Then by $\beta_{i,0} = 0$ and $\alpha_{i,k} = \eta^{\beta_{i,k}+1}$, we have the following for any $k \geq 0$

$$\mathbb{E}[\alpha_{i,k}^2] \leq \eta^2\tilde{\eta}^{2k}\ \ \forall i \in \mathcal{N},$$

and hence by (34) we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|||e_k|||^2\right] \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}\left[\alpha_{i,k}^2\right] \leq N\eta^2\tilde{\eta}^{2k}\ \ \forall k \geq 0.$$

Thus, by (37), we have the following inequality for any $k \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[|||x_k - x^*|||\right] &\leq \tilde{a}\mathbb{E}\left[|||x_{k-1} - x^*|||\right] + \sqrt{N}\eta\tilde{\eta}^{-1}\tilde{\eta}^k. \\ &\leq \tilde{a}^k|||x_0 - x^*||| + \sqrt{N}\eta\tilde{\eta}^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\tilde{a}^{k-j}\tilde{\eta}^j \\ &\leq C\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i^{-1}\right)^{1/2}\tilde{c}^k + \sqrt{N}\eta\tilde{\eta}^{-1}k\tilde{c}^k,\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{c} \triangleq \max\{\tilde{a}, \tilde{\eta}\}$. Then by Lemma 2, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|||x_k - x^*|||\right] \leq C\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i^{-1}\right)^{1/2}\tilde{q}^k + \sqrt{N}\eta\tilde{\eta}^{-1}D\tilde{q}^k \leq \sqrt{N}(\widetilde{C} + \tilde{D})\tilde{q}^k,$$

where $\tilde{q} > \tilde{c}$, $D \triangleq 1/\ln((\tilde{q}/\tilde{c})^e)$, $\widetilde{C} \triangleq C\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} N^{-1}p_i^{-1}\right)^{1/2}$, and $\widetilde{D} \triangleq D\eta\tilde{\eta}^{-1}$. □

Remark 6 *By the definition* $|||x|||^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{p_i}\|x_i\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{p_{\max}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\|x_i\|^2$, *where* $p_{\max} = \max_{i\in\mathcal{N}} p_i$. *Hence*

$$|||x_k - x^*||| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N}\|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|^2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}v_k,$$

where v_k *is defined in* (12). *Then we have that*

$$u_k \leq \sqrt{p_{\max}}\mathbb{E}[|||x_k - x^*|||] \leq (Np_{\max})^{1/2}(\widetilde{C} + \tilde{D})\tilde{q}^k,$$

where u_k *is defined in* (15).

4.4 Overall Iteration Complexity

We proceed to estimate the overall iteration complexity, where the inexact proximal response solution is computed via the stochastic approximation schemes. At the major iteration k: if $\chi_{i,k} = 1$, then player i takes stochastic gradient steps (SA$_{i,k}$) from $t = 1, \ldots, j_{i,k}$. We define $\xi_{i,k}$, I_k, $\mathcal{F}_k$ as $\xi_{i,k} \triangleq (\xi_{i,k}^1, \cdots, \xi_{i,k}^{j_{i,k}})$, $I_k \triangleq \{i \in \mathcal{N} : \chi_{i,k} = 1\}$, and $\mathcal{F}_k \triangleq \sigma\{x_0, \{\xi_{i,l}\}_{i\in I_k}, \{\chi_{i,l}\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}, 0 \leq l \leq k-1\}$, respectively. Then, by Algorithm 2 , we see that x_k is adapted to $\mathcal{F}_k$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 3, we obtain the following result for the stochastic approximation scheme (SA$_{i,k}$).

Lemma 6 *Let Assumption 1 hold. Assume that for any* $i \in I_k$ *the random variables* $\{\xi_{i,k}^t\}_{1\leq t\leq j_{i,k}}$ *are i.i.d, and in addition, that the random vector* $\xi_{i,k}$ *is independent of* $\mathcal{F}_k$. *Then for any* $i \in I_k$ *and any* $t \geq 1$ *we have that* $\mathbb{E}[\|z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2|\mathcal{F}_k] \leq Q_i/(t+1)$ *a.s., where* $Q_i \triangleq \frac{2M_i^2}{\mu^2} + 2D_{X_i}^2$.

Theorem 2 *Let the sequence* $\{x_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ *be generated by Algorithm 2, where* $\alpha_{i,k} = \eta^{\beta_{i,k}+1}$ *for some* $\eta \in (0,1)$ *and* $\mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,0} - x_i^*\|] \leq C\ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$. *Suppose that an inexact solution characterized by* (31) *is computed via* (SA$_{i,k}$). *Let Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold. Suppose* $Q_i \triangleq \frac{2M_i^2}{\mu^2} + 2D_{X_i}^2$, $\tilde{a}$, $\tilde{\eta}$ *and* $\tilde{\eta}_0$ *are defined by* (36), (38) *and* (41), *respectively, and* $\widetilde{C} = C\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} N^{-1}p_i^{-1}\right)^{1/2}$. *Then expectation of the number of projected gradient steps for player* i *to compute an* $\epsilon-$*Nash equilibrium is no greater than*

$$\tilde{\ell}_i(\eta) \triangleq \frac{p_iQ_i}{\eta^2\tilde{\eta}_0^2\ln(1/\tilde{\eta}_0^2)}\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\epsilon}}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1/\tilde{\eta}_0^2)}{\ln(1/\tilde{q})}} + \left\lceil\frac{\ln(1/\tilde{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\tilde{q})}\right\rceil, \tag{39}$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon} \triangleq \frac{\epsilon}{(Np_{\max})^{1/2}(\widetilde{C}+\widetilde{D})}$, $\tilde{q} > \tilde{c} \triangleq \max\{\tilde{a}, \tilde{\eta}\}$, $D \triangleq 1/\ln((\tilde{q}/\tilde{c})^e)$, *and* $\widetilde{D} = D\eta\tilde{\eta}^{-1}$. *If* $\eta = a$, *then given any* $\delta > 0$, $\tilde{\ell}_i(\eta)$ *satisfies the following upper bound:*

$$\tilde{\ell}_i(\eta) \leq \frac{p_i Q_i}{\tilde{\eta}^2 \eta^2 \ln(1/\tilde{\eta}^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\epsilon}}\right)^{2\ln(\tilde{\eta}_0^{-1})/\ln(\tilde{\eta}^{-1})+\delta} + \left\lceil \ln(1/\tilde{\epsilon}) \left(\frac{1}{\ln(\tilde{\eta}^{-1})} + \frac{\delta}{2\ln(\tilde{\eta}_0^{-1})} \right) \right\rceil, \tag{40}$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon} \triangleq \frac{\epsilon}{(Np_{\max})^{1/2}(\widetilde{C}+\widetilde{D})}$ *and* $\widetilde{D} = D\eta\tilde{\eta}^{-1}$ *with* D *given by* (42).

Proof. Suppose that $j_{i,k} = \left\lceil \frac{Q_i}{\eta^{2(\beta_{i,k}+1)}} \right\rceil$ steps of the stochastic approximation scheme ($\mathrm{SA}_{i,k}$) are taken at major iteration k to obtain $x_{i,k+1}$, i.e., $x_{i,k+1} = z_{i,j_{i,k}}$. Then by Lemma 6, we see that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_k\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\|z_{i,j_{i,k}} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k)\|^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_k\right] \leq \frac{Q_i}{j_{i,k}} \leq \alpha_{i,k}^2 \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}.$$

By Remark 6, we have that

$$u_{k+1} \leq (Np_{\max})^{1/2}(\widetilde{C} + \widetilde{D})\tilde{q}^{k+1} \leq \epsilon \Rightarrow\ k \geq \frac{\ln(1/\bar{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\tilde{q})} - 1,$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon} \triangleq \frac{\epsilon}{(Np_{\max})^{1/2}(\widetilde{C}+\widetilde{D})}$. Similar to (38) we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[\eta^{-2\beta_{i,k}}] = (p_i\eta^{-2} + 1 - p_i)^k = \left(p_i(\eta^{-2}-1)+1\right)^k \leq \left(p_{\max}(\eta^{-2}-1)+1\right)^k \triangleq \tilde{\eta}_0^{-2k}\ \ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{41}$$

Then by invoking (30) for $\beta > 1$, the expectation of the overall iteration complexity of player i is bounded by the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\tilde{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\tilde{q})} \right\rceil - 1} j_{i,k}\chi_{i,k}\right] &= \sum_{k=0}^{\left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\tilde{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\tilde{q})} \right\rceil - 1} \mathbb{E}\left[j_{i,k}\right]\mathbb{E}[\chi_{i,k}] \quad \left(\text{since } \chi_{i,k} \text{ is independent of } \mathrm{j_{i,k}}\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\tilde{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\tilde{q})} \rceil - 1} \left(\frac{p_i Q_i}{\eta^2 \tilde{\eta}_0^{2k}} + 1\right) = \frac{\tilde{\eta}_0^2}{\eta^2} \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\tilde{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\tilde{q})} \rceil} \frac{p_i Q_i}{\tilde{\eta}_0^{2k}} + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\tilde{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\tilde{q})} \right\rceil \\
&\leq \frac{\tilde{\eta}_0^2}{\eta^2} \frac{p_i Q_i}{\ln(1/\tilde{\eta}_0^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\eta}_0^{2\left(\frac{\ln(1/\tilde{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\tilde{q})}+2\right)}} \right) + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\tilde{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\tilde{q})} \right\rceil \\
&= \frac{p_i Q_i}{\tilde{\eta}_0^2 \eta^2 \ln(1/\tilde{\eta}_0^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\epsilon}}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1/\tilde{\eta}_0^2)}{\ln(1/\tilde{q})}} + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\tilde{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/\tilde{q})} \right\rceil.
\end{aligned}$$

Then the bound (39) is achieved.

If $\eta = a$, then by $\tilde{a}$ and $\tilde{\eta}$ defined in (36) and (38), we have that $\tilde{a} = \tilde{\eta}$ and $\tilde{c} = \tilde{a}$. Define $\tilde{q} = \tilde{\eta}e^{\delta_0/2}$, where $\delta_0 = \frac{\delta \ln(\tilde{\eta}^{-1})}{\ln(\tilde{\eta}_0^{-1})/\ln(\tilde{\eta}^{-1})+\delta/2}$. Then we obtain the following:

$$\ln(1/\tilde{q}) = \ln(\tilde{\eta}^{-1}) - \delta_0/2 = \frac{\ln(\tilde{\eta}_0^{-1})}{\ln(\tilde{\eta}_0^{-1})/\ln(\tilde{\eta}^{-1}) + \delta/2} = \frac{1}{1/\ln(\tilde{\eta}^{-1}) + \delta/2\ln(\tilde{\eta}_0^{-1})},$$

$$\text{and}\ \ \frac{\ln(1/\tilde{\eta}_0^2)}{\ln(1/\tilde{q})} = \frac{2\ln(\tilde{\eta}_0^{-1})}{\ln(1/\tilde{q})} = \frac{2\ln(\tilde{\eta}_0^{-1})}{\ln(\tilde{\eta}^{-1})} + \delta,$$

and

$$D = 1/\ln((\tilde{q}/\tilde{c})^e) = 1/\ln(e^{\delta_0 e/2}) = \frac{2}{\delta_0 e} = \frac{\ln(\tilde{\eta}_0^{-1})/\ln(\tilde{\eta}^{-1}) + 2\delta^{-1}}{e\ln(\tilde{\eta}^{-1})}. \tag{42}$$

Consequently, the result (40) follows by the expression $\tilde{\ell}_i(\tilde{\eta})$ defined in (39). □

Remark 7 *We make the following illustrations on Theorem 2:*
(i) *If* $p_i = 1\ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$, *then* $\widetilde{Q} = Q$ *and* $p_{\min} = 1$. *Thus, from* (36), (38), (41) *we see that* $\tilde{a} = a, \tilde{\eta} = \eta, \tilde{\eta}_0 = \eta$, *and hence* $\widetilde{C} = C, \widetilde{D} = D$. *As a result, the results of Lemma 5 and Theorem 2 for the randomized scheme degenerate to those given in Proposition 4 and Theorem 1 for the synchronous scheme, respectively.*
(ii) *Note that the iteration complexity in Theorem 2 of the randomized algorithm is described via the expectation of the number of projected gradient steps. This is because the number of gradient steps to get an inexact solution* (31) *is a random variable depending on the implementation of the update indices in each major iteration.*
(iii) *By definitions* (38) *and* (41) *we have that*

$$(\tilde{\eta}/\tilde{\eta}_0)^2 = 1 + p_{\max}(\eta^{-2} - 1)p_{\min}\left(\frac{1}{p_{\min}} - \frac{\eta^2}{p_{\max}} - (1-\eta^2)\right) \geq 1 + p_{\max}(1-p_{\min})\eta^{-2}(1-\eta^2)^2.$$

As a result, $\tilde{\eta}/\tilde{\eta}_0 \geq 1$, *where the equality holds only if* $p_{\min} = 1$. *Hence for the case* $p_{\min} < 1$, *the theoretic complexity bound is greater than those given in Proposition 4 and Theorem 1. The cost might be brought by the randomized index selection scheme that accommodates much flexibility into the designing of update scheme.*

5 An Asynchronous Inexact Proximal Best-response Algorithm

Asynchronous methods date back to [39] when they were employed for the solution of systems of linear equations. Subsequently, they were used in optimization problems, in which a partially asynchronous gradient projection algorithm is proposed in [28], while the convergence rate is analyzed in [41]. In this section, we adapt the scheme developed in [28] to stochastic Nash games and propose an asynchronous inexact proximal best-response algorithm. Then we proceed to analyze the rate of convergence and derive an upper bound on the overall iteration complexity in terms of projected stochastic gradient steps.

5.1 Algorithm Design

The synchronous algorithm designed in the previous section requires that all players update their strategies simultaneously. In a network with a large collection of noncooperative players, players might not be able to make simultaneous updates nor may they have access to their rivals' latest information. In this context, we propose the following asynchronous scheme. Let $T = \{0, 1, 2, \cdots\}$ be a set of epochs at which one or more players update their strategies. Denote by $I_k \in \mathcal{N}$ the set of players which update their strategies at time k. For any $i \in I_k$, player i may not obtain its rivals' latest information, instead, the outdated data $y_k^i \triangleq (x_{1,k-\tau_{i1}(k)}, \cdots, x_{N,k-\tau_{iN}(k)})$ is available to player i, where $\tau_{ij}(k) \leq k, j = 1, \cdots, N$ are random nonnegative integers representing communication delays from player j to player i at time k. Set $\tau_{ii}(k) = 0$ without loss of generality.

The following Algorithm 3 presents the asynchronous inexact proximal best-response scheme, where $\mathcal{F}_k = \sigma\{\mathcal{F}_k', \{\tau_{ij}(k)\}_{i\in I_k, j\in\mathcal{N}}\}$ with $\mathcal{F}_k'$ being the σ-field of the entire information employed by the algorithm up to (and including) the update of x_k. It is worth noticing that y_k^i is adapted to $\mathcal{F}_k$ while is not adapted to $\mathcal{F}_k'$ since y_k^i depends on $\{\tau_{ij}(k)\}_{j\in\mathcal{N}}$. We will define $\mathcal{F}_k$ in Section 5.3 and the sequence $\{\alpha_{i,k}\}$ will be specified when we analyse the convergence properties of Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 Asynchronous inexact proximal best-response scheme

Let $k := 0$, $x_{i,0} \in X_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

(1) For any $i \in I_k$, set $y_k^i = (x_{1,k-\tau_{i1}(k)}, \cdots, x_{N,k-\tau_{iN}(k)})$.

(2) If $i \in I_k$, then player i updates $x_{i,k+1}$ as follows:

$$x_{i,k+1} \in \left\{ z \in X_i : \mathbb{E}\left[\|z - \widehat{x}_i(y_k^i)\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_k \right] \leq \alpha_{i,k}^2 \ \ a.s. \right\}, \tag{43}$$

where $\widehat{x}_i(y_k^i)$ is defined in (7) with y_k replaced by y_k^i. Otherwise, $x_{i,k+1} = x_{i,k}$ for any $i \notin I_k$.

(3) $k := k + 1$; If $k < K$, return to (1); else STOP.

We impose the following assumptions on the asynchronous protocol, and on the parameters $\zeta_{i,\min}, \zeta_{ij,\max}, i, j = 1, \cdots, N$ that are defined in (4).

Assumption 4 *a) The sequence of sets $\{I_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ is deterministic.*
b) Each player $i \in \mathcal{N}$ updates its strategy at least once during any time interval of length b_i. In addition, there exists a positive integer B_1 such that $b_i \leq B_1 \ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$;
c) There exists a random variable τ_{ij} such that $\tau_{ij}(k) \leq \tau_{ij} \ \forall k \geq 0, i \in I_k, j \in \mathcal{N}$ $a.s.$ Furthermore, there exists a nonnegative integer B_2 such that $\tau_{ij} \leq B_2 \ \forall i, j \in \mathcal{N}$ $a.s.$

By Assumption 4(b) we see that for any $k \geq 0$ and any $i \in I_k, j \in \mathcal{N}$

$$\max\{0, k - B_2\} \leq \max\{0, k - \tau_{ij}\} \leq k - \tau_{ij}(k) \leq k \quad a.s. \tag{44}$$

Assumption 5 *(Strict Diagonal Dominance) For any $i = 1, \cdots, N$,*

$$\zeta_{i,\min} > \sum_{j \neq i} \zeta_{ij,\max}.$$

Then from this assumption by Γ defined in (3) we see that $a \triangleq \|\Gamma\|_\infty < 1$. Let $y : \Omega \to X$ be a random variable defined on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Then by taking expectations on both sides of (5), we obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{x}_1(y) - \widehat{x}_1(x^*)\|] \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{x}_N(y) - \widehat{x}_N(x^*)\|] \end{pmatrix} \leq \Gamma \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\|y_1 - x_1^*\|] \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{E}[\|y_N - x_N^*\|] \end{pmatrix},$$

and hence by taking the infinity norm, we have that

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{x}_1(y) - \widehat{x}_1(x^*)\|] \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{x}_N(y) - \widehat{x}_N(x^*)\|] \end{pmatrix} \right\|_\infty \leq a \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\|y_1 - x_1^*\|] \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{E}[\|y_N - x_N^*\|] \end{pmatrix} \right\|_\infty.$$

As a result, by $x_i^* = \widehat{x}_i(x^*)$ we see that for any $i = 1, \cdots, N$

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{x}_i(y) - x_i^*\|] = \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{x}_i(y) - \widehat{x}_i(x^*)\|] \leq a \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|y_i - x_i^*\|]. \tag{45}$$

5.2 Rate of Convergence

Define n_0 as follows:

$$n_0 \triangleq \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } B_2 = 0; \\ p_0, & \text{if } (p_0-1)B_1 + 1 \leq B_2 \leq p_0 B_1 \text{ for some integer } p_0 \geq 1. \end{cases} \tag{46}$$

Then $n_0 = \lceil \frac{B_2}{B_1} \rceil$ by definition of the ceiling function. Denote by $\beta_{i,k}$ the number of updates player has carried out up to (and including) major iteration k.

Lemma 7 *Let the asynchronous inexact proximal best-response scheme (Algorithm 3) be applied to the N-player stochastic Nash game (SNash), where $\alpha_{i,k} = \eta^{\beta_{i,k}}$ for some scalar $\eta \in (0,1)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,0} - x_i^*\|] \leq C$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Suppose Assumptions 1, 4, and 5 hold. Then we have the following for any $k \geq 0$:*

$$\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|] \leq (C+k)\rho^{\lfloor \frac{k}{B_1} \rfloor}, \tag{47}$$

where $\rho \triangleq \max\{a, \eta\}\rho^{-n_0}$ with n_0 defined in (46)*. Furthermore,*

$$\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|] \leq \rho^{-\frac{B_1-1}{B_1}}(C+D)q^k \ \ \forall k \geq 0, \tag{48}$$

where $q > c \triangleq \rho^{\frac{1}{B_1}}$, and $D > 1/\ln((q/c)^e)$.

Proof. For any $i \in I_k$, by Algorithm 3 we see that

$$\|x_{i,k+1} - x_i^*\| \leq \|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k^i)\| + \|\widehat{x}_i(y_k^i) - \widehat{x}_i(x^*)\|.$$

Then by taking expectations conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_k$, by (43) and the conditional Jensen's inequality, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|x_{i,k+1} - x_i^*\| \big| \mathcal{F}_k\right] \leq \alpha_{i,k} + \mathbb{E}\left[\|\widehat{x}_i(y_k^i) - \widehat{x}_i(x^*)\| \big| \mathcal{F}_k\right].$$

Note that $\alpha_{i,k}$ is a deterministic value by Assumption 4(a). By taking unconditional expectations on both sides of the above inequality, recalling that $y_k^i = (x_{1,k-\tau_{i1}(k)}, \cdots, x_{N,k-\tau_{iN}(k)})$, and (45), we have that for any $i \in I_k$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,k+1} - x_i^*\|] \leq \alpha_{i,k} + a \max_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{j,k-\tau_{ij}(k)} - x_j^*\|]. \tag{49}$$

We now prove inequality (47) by induction. It is obvious that (47) holds for $k = 0$ by $\mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,0} - x_i^*\|] \leq C$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Inductively, we assume that (47) holds for all k up to some nonnegative integer $\bar{k}$. We will validate that (47) holds for $k = \bar{k}+1$ by considering two cases: $\bar{k} = (p+1)B_1 - 1$ or $\bar{k} \in [pB_1, (p+1)B_1 - 1)$ for some nonnegative integer p. We first prove that the following inequality holds for either case:

$$\max_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{j,k-\tau_{ij}(k)} - x_j^*\|] \leq (C+k)\rho^{\max\{0, p-n_0\}} \ \ \forall k \in [pB_1, \bar{k}]. \tag{50}$$

Notice that $\lfloor \bar{k}/B_1 \rfloor = p$. Then by the induction that (47) holds for all $k \leq \bar{k}$, we have

$$\max_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{j,k} - x_j^*\|] \leq (C+k)\rho^p \ \ \forall k \in [pB_1, \bar{k}]. \tag{51}$$

If $B_2 = 0$, then $k - \tau_{ij}(k) = k$ and $n_0 = 0$ by its definition (46). Then by (51), we obtain the following:

$$\max_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{j,k-\tau_{ij}(k)} - x_j^*\|] = \max_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{j,k} - x_j^*\|] \leq (C+k)\rho^p = (C+k)\rho^{\max\{0,p-n_0\}} \ \ \forall k \in [pB_1, \bar{k}].$$

Thus, (50) holds when $\lceil \frac{B_2}{B_1} \rceil = 0$. If B_2 satisfies $(n_0-1)B_1 + 1 \leq B_2 \leq n_0 B_1$ for some positive integer $n_0 \geq 1$ and $k \in [pB_1, \bar{k}]$, then by (44), we obtain

$$\max\{0, (p-n_0)B_1\} \leq \max\{0, k - n_0 B_1\} \leq \max\{0, k - B_2\} \leq k - \tau_{ij}(k) \leq k \ \ a.s.$$

Then we have the following for all $k \in [pB_1, \bar{k}]$:

$$\max_{j\in\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{j,k-\tau_{ij}(k)} - x_j^*\|] \leq \max_{\max\{0,(p-n_0)B_1\}\leq t\leq k} \ \max_{j\in\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{j,t} - x_j^*\|]. \tag{52}$$

We consider the following two possible cases:
i) If $\max\{0, (p-n_0)B_1\} = 0$, then by the inductive assumption, we have that for any $k \in [pB_1, \bar{k}]$:

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{\max\{0,(p-n_0)B_1\}\leq t\leq k} \ \max_{j\in\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{j,t} - x_j^*\|] &= \max_{0\leq t\leq k} \ \max_{j\in\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{j,t} - x_j^*\|] \\ &\leq \max_{0\leq t\leq k} (C+t)\rho^{\lfloor \frac{t}{B_1} \rfloor} \leq C + k \quad (\text{since } \rho\in(0,1)).\end{aligned}$$

ii) If $\max\{0, (p-n_0)B_1\} = (p-n_0)B_1$, then by the inductive assumption, we have that for any $k \in [pB_1, \bar{k}]$:

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{\max\{0,(p-n_0)B_1\}\leq t\leq k} \ \max_{j\in\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{j,t} - x_j^*\|] &= \max_{(p-n_0)B_1\leq t\leq k} \ \max_{j\in\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{j,t} - x_j^*\|] \\ &\leq \max_{(p-n_0)B_1\leq t\leq k} (C+t)\rho^{\lfloor \frac{t}{B_1} \rfloor} \leq (C+k)\rho^{p-n_0} \quad (\text{since } \rho\in(0,1)).\end{aligned}$$

Combining cases i) and ii), by (52), we have the following bound:

$$\max_{j\in\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{j,k-\tau_{ij}(k)} - x_j^*\|] \leq (C+k)\rho^{\max\{0,p-n_0\}},$$

and hence (50) holds when $\lceil \frac{B_2}{B_1} \rceil \geq 1$. Consequently, we have shown (50).

We proceed to prove that (47) holds for $k = \bar{k} + 1$.

Case 1: The integer $\bar{k} = (p+1)B_1 - 1$ for some nonnegative integer p. By the inductive assumption, it is seen that (47) holds for any $k \in [pB_1, (p+1)B_1)$. Note that each player updates at least once during any time interval of length B_1 by Assumption 4. Then player i updates its strategy at least p times in the time interval $[0, pB_1)$, and there exists at least one integer $k_i \in [pB_1, (p+1)B_1)$ such that $i \in I_{k_i}$. Set k_i to be the largest integer in the set $[pB_1, (p+1)B_1)$ such that $i \in I_{k_i}$. Then $\beta_{i,k_i} \geq p+1$, hence by (49) and (50), we derive the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,k_i+1} - x_i^*\|] &\leq \alpha_{i,k_i} + a \max_{j\in\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{j,k_i-\tau_{ij}(k_i)} - x_j^*\|] \\ &\leq \eta^{p+1} + a(C+k_i)\rho^{\max\{p-n_0,0\}} \quad \left(\text{since } \alpha_{i,k_i}=\eta^{\beta_{i,k_i}} \text{ and } \eta\in(0,1)\right) \\ &\leq \rho^{p+1} + (C+k_i)\rho^{p+1} \quad \left(\text{since } 1>\rho\geq\max\{a\rho^{-n_0},\eta\}\right) \\ &\leq (C+k_i+1)\rho^{p+1}.\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Therefore, for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$, by the selection of k_i and the definition of Algorithm 3, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,k+1} - x_i^*\|] &= \mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,k_i+1} - x_i^*\|] \\ &\leq (C+k_i+1)\rho^{p+1} \quad (\text{from inequality (53)}) \\ &\leq (C+k+1)\rho^{p+1} \ \ \forall k : k_i \leq k < (p+1)B_1.\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\max_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,(p+1)B_1} - x_i^*\|] \leq (C + (p+1)B_1)\rho^{p+1},$$

and hence (47) holds for $k = \bar{k} + 1$ when $\bar{k} = (p+1)B_1 - 1$.

Case 2: The integer $\bar{k} \in [pB_1, (p+1)B_1 - 1)$ for some nonnegative integer p. For any $i \in I_{\bar{k}}$ we have that $\beta_{i,k_i} \geq p+1$, then by (49) and (50), we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{x}_{i,\bar{k}+1} - x_i^*\|] &\leq \alpha_{i,\bar{k}} + a \max_{j\in\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{j,k-\tau_{ij}(\bar{k})} - x_j^*\|] \\
&\leq \eta^{p+1} + a(C+\bar{k})\rho^{\max\{p-n_0,0\}} \quad \left(\text{since } \alpha_{i,\bar{k}}=\eta^{\beta_{i,\bar{k}}} \text{ and } \eta\in(0,1)\right) \\
&\leq \rho^{p+1} + (C+\bar{k})\rho^{p+1} \quad \left(\text{since } 1>\rho\geq\max\{a\rho^{-n_0},\eta\}\right) \\
&\leq (C+\bar{k}+1)\rho^{p+1} \\
&< (C+\bar{k}+1)\rho^{p} \ \ \forall i \in I_{\bar{k}}.
\end{aligned}$$

For any $i \notin I_{\bar{k}}$, by (51), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,\bar{k}+1} - x_i^*\|] = \mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,\bar{k}} - x_i^*\|] \leq (C+\bar{k})\rho^p < (C+\bar{k}+1)\rho^p,$$

and hence (47) holds for $k = \bar{k}+1$.

By combing Cases 1 and 2, we conclude that (47) holds for $k = \bar{k}+1$. Thus, by induction, we obtain (47) for any $k \geq 0$.

Since $\left\lfloor \frac{k}{B_1} \right\rfloor \geq \frac{k}{B_1} - \frac{B_1-1}{B_1}$ and $0 < \rho < 1$, by (47) we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,k} - x_i^*\|] &\leq (C+k)\rho^{\frac{k}{B_1} - \frac{B_1-1}{B_1}} \\
&= \rho^{-\frac{B_1-1}{B_1}}(C+k)\rho^{\frac{k}{B_1}} \\
&= \rho^{-\frac{B_1-1}{B_1}}(C+k)c^k, \ \ \forall k \geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

From Lemma 2, there exist scalars q and D satisfying $q \in (c,1)$ and $D > 1/\ln((q/c)^e)$ such that

$$kc^k < Dq^k \ \ \forall k \geq 0,$$

which incorporating with (54) and $c^k < q^k$ yields (48). □

5.3 Overall Iteration Complexity in Projected Stochastic Gradient Steps

We proceed to derive a bound on the overall iteration complexity, when the inexact proximal response solution is computed via stochastic approximation schemes. At major iteration k: if $i \in I_k$, then given y_k^i, the ith player takes the following sequence of *stochastic* gradient steps from $t = 1, \ldots, j_{i,k}$

$$z_{i,t+1} := \Pi_{X_i}\left[z_{i,t} - \gamma_t\big(\nabla_{x_i}\psi_i(z_{i,t}, y^i_{-i,k}; \xi^t_{i,k}) + \mu(z_{i,t} - x_{i,k})\big)\right], \tag{55}$$

where $z_{i,1} = x_{i,k}$, and $\gamma_t = 1/\mu(t+1)$.

Define $\xi_{i,k} \triangleq (\xi^1_{i,k}, \cdots, \xi^{j_{i,k}}_{i,k})$, $\mathcal{F}'_k \triangleq \sigma\{x_0, \xi_{i,l}, \{\tau_i(l)\}_{i\in\mathrm{I}_l}, 0 \leq l \leq k-1\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_k \triangleq \sigma\{\mathcal{F}'_k, \{\tau_i(k)\}_{i\in I_k}\}$, where $\tau_i(k) \triangleq (\tau_{i1}(k), \cdots, \tau_{iN}(k))$. Then by Algorithm 3, we see that x_k is adapted to $\mathcal{F}'_k$ while $\{y^i_k\}_{i\in I_k}$ is adapted to $\mathcal{F}_k$. Since $\mathcal{F}'_k \subset \mathcal{F}_k$, similar to the proof of Lemma 3, we can also obtain the following result for the scheme (55).

Lemma 8 *Let Assumption 1 hold. Assume that for any $i \in I_k$ the random variables $\{\xi^t_{i,k}\}_{1\leq t\leq j_{i,k}}$ are independent and identically distributed, and in addition, that the random vector $\xi_{i,k}$ is independent of $\mathcal{F}_k$. Then for any $i \in I_k$ and any $t \geq 1$ we have $\mathbb{E}[\|z_{i,t} - \widehat{x}_i(y^i_k)\|^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_k] \leq Q_i/(t+1)$ a.s., where $Q_i \triangleq \frac{2M_i^2}{\mu^2} + 2D^2_{X_i}$.*

Different from the definition of $\epsilon-$Nash equilibrium given in (27), for the asynchronous algorithm a random strategy profile $x : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is called an $\epsilon-$Nash equilibrium when

$$\max_{i\in\mathcal{V}} \ \mathbb{E}[\|x_i - x_i^*\|] \leq \epsilon. \tag{56}$$

Theorem 3 *Let Algorithm 3 be applied to the stochastic Nash game (SNash), where where $\alpha_{i,k} = \eta^{\beta_{i,k}}$ for some scalar $\eta \in (0,1)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,0} - x_i^*\|^2] \leq C^2$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Suppose that an inexact solution characterized by* (43) *is computed via the stochastic approximation scheme* ($\mathrm{SA}_{i,k}$)*. Let Assumptions 1, 4 and 5 hold. Suppose $Q_i \triangleq \frac{2M_i^2}{\mu^2} + 2D_{X_i}^2$, $a = \|\Gamma\|_\infty$, and $\rho \triangleq \max\{a, \eta\}\rho^{-n_0}$ with $n_0 = \lceil \frac{B_2}{B_1} \rceil$. Then the number of projected gradient steps for player i to compute an $\epsilon-$Nash equilibrium is no greater than*

$$\ell_i{}^{(1)}(\eta) \triangleq \frac{Q_i}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\epsilon}}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1/\eta^2)}{\ln(1/q)}} + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\hat{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q)} \right\rceil, \tag{57}$$

where $\hat{\epsilon}$ is defined in (58)*, $\eta \in (0,1)$, $q > c \triangleq \rho^{\frac{1}{B_1}}$, and $D > 1/\ln((q/c)^e)$. In particular, if $B_1 = 1, B_2 = 0$, then* (57) *reduces to $\frac{Q_i}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{C+D}{\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1/\eta^2)}{\ln(1/q)}}$ with $q > c \triangleq \max\{a, \eta\}$ and $D > 1/\ln((q/c)^e)$.*

Proof. For any $i \in I_k$, let $j_{i,k} = \lceil \frac{Q_i}{\eta^{2(k+1)}} \rceil$ be the number of steps of the scheme (55) taken by player i in major iteration k to obtain $x_{i,k+1}$, i.e., $x_{i,k+1} := z_{i,j_{i,k}}$. Since $\beta_{i,k} \leq k+1$ and $\eta \in (0,1)$, by Lemma 8, we have the following for any $i \in I_k$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k^i)\|^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_k\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\|z_{i,j_{i,k}} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k^i)\|^2 \big| \mathcal{F}_k\right] \leq \frac{Q_i}{j_{i,k}} \leq \eta^{2(k+1)} \leq \eta^{2\beta_{i,k}} = \alpha_{i,k}^2 \ \ a.s.$$

By (48), we may obtain a lower bound on k as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,k+1} - x_i^*\|] \leq \rho^{-\frac{B_1-1}{B_1}}(C+D)q^{k+1} \leq \epsilon \\ \Rightarrow q^{k+1} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{C+D}\rho^{\frac{B_1-1}{B_1}} \triangleq \hat{\epsilon} \\ \Rightarrow k \geq \frac{\ln(1/\hat{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q)} - 1. \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

Then by $\sum_{k=1}^K \beta^k \leq \frac{\beta^{K+1}}{\ln(\beta)}$ for $\beta > 1$, we derive the following complexity bound for player i:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\hat{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q)} \right\rceil - 1} j_{i,k} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\hat{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q)} \right\rceil - 1} \left(\frac{Q_i}{\eta^{2(k+1)}} + 1\right) = \sum_{k=1}^{\left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\hat{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q)} \right\rceil} \frac{Q_i}{\eta^{2k}} + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\hat{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q)} \right\rceil. \tag{59}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\hat{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q)} \rceil} \frac{1}{\eta^{2k}} &\leq \frac{1}{\ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\eta^{2\left(\frac{\ln(1/\hat{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q)}+2\right)}}\right) = \frac{1}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} \frac{1}{\left(e^{\ln(\eta^2)}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1/\hat{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q)}}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} \frac{1}{\left((1/\hat{\epsilon})^{\frac{\ln(\eta^2)}{\ln(1/q)}}\right)} = \frac{1}{\eta^4 \ln(1/\eta^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\epsilon}}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1/\eta^2)}{\ln(1/q)}}. \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Then by (59) we derive the result. □

Coordinate update methods advocate that only a small bock of variables are updated in each iteration while others are fixed [42]. The blocks of variables can be updated in the *cyclic, random,* or *greedy* orders. In Section 4 we have studied the randomized update scheme, whereas here we consider a cyclic update scheme to adapt to more problem settings, and analyze the iteration complexity.

Proposition 6 *Let Algorithm 3 be applied to the stochastic Nash game (SNash), where $\alpha_{i,k} = \eta^{\beta_{i,k}}$ for some $\eta \in (0,1)$. Suppose that an inexact solution characterized by* (43) *is computed via the stochastic approximation scheme* ($\mathrm{SA}_{i,k}$)*. Let Assumptions 1, 4 and 5 hold. Suppose that the players are chosen to update cyclicly, $a = \|\Gamma\|_\infty$, and $\rho \triangleq \max\{a,\eta\}\rho^{-n_0}$ with $n_0 = \lceil \frac{B_2}{N} \rceil$. Then the number of projected gradient steps for player i to compute an $\epsilon-$Nash equilibrium is no greater than*

$$\ell_i{}^{(2)}(\eta) \triangleq \frac{Q_i}{\tilde{\eta}^2\eta^2\ln(1/\tilde{\eta}^2)}\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\epsilon}}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1/\tilde{\eta}^2)}{\ln(1/q)}} + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\tilde{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q)} \right\rceil,$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon} \triangleq \frac{\epsilon}{C+D}\rho^{\frac{N-1}{N}}$, $\eta \in (0,1)$, $\tilde{\eta} = \eta^{1/N}$, $q > c \triangleq \rho^{\frac{1}{N}}$, and $D > 1/\ln((q/c)^e)$.

Proof. For any $i \in I_k$, let $j_{i,k} = \left\lceil \frac{Q_i}{\eta^{2+2k/N}} \right\rceil$ be the steps of the stochastic approximation scheme (55) computed for player i at major iteration k. Set $x_{i,k+1} := z_{i,j_{i,k}}$. By the cyclic rule, we see that $B_1 = N$, and each player $i \in \mathcal{N}$ is picked exactly once among N steps. As a result, $\beta_{i,k} = \lceil \frac{k+1}{N} \rceil$ when $i \in I_k$, and hence $\beta_{i,k} \leq \frac{k}{N} + 1$. Then by $\eta \in (0,1)$ and Lemma 3, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\|x_{i,k+1} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k^i)\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\|z_{i,j_{i,k}} - \widehat{x}_i(y_k^i)\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k\right] \\ &\leq \frac{Q_i}{j_{i,k}} \leq \eta^{2+2k/N} \leq \eta^{2\beta_{i,k}} = \alpha_{i,k}^2, \quad \forall i \in I_k.\end{aligned}$$

Since $j_{i,k} = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\eta^{2(N-1)/N}} \frac{Q_i}{\tilde{\eta}^{2(k+1)}} \right\rceil$, by the similar procedure for deriving (60) we obtain the following complexity bound for player i:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=0}^{\left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\hat{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q)} \right\rceil - 1} j_{i,k} &\leq \frac{1}{\eta^{2(N-1)/N}} \sum_{k=0}^{\left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\hat{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q)} \right\rceil - 1} \frac{Q_i}{\tilde{\eta}^{2(k+1)}} + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\hat{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q)} \right\rceil \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\eta^{2(N-1)/N}} \frac{Q_i}{\tilde{\eta}^4 \ln(1/\tilde{\eta}^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\epsilon}}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1/\tilde{\eta}^2)}{\ln(1/q)}} + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1/\hat{\epsilon})}{\ln(1/q)} \right\rceil.\end{aligned}$$

Then the result follows by $\tilde{\eta} = \eta^{1/N}$ and by $\hat{\epsilon}$ defined in (58) with $B_1 = N$. □

5.4 Complexity Bound

In the following theorem, we drive the upper bound for $\ell_i{}^{(1)}(\eta)$ and $\ell_i{}^{(2)}(\eta)$ defined in Theorem 3 and Proposition 6, respectively.

Theorem 4 *(***Upper bound on iteration complexity***) Suppose $Q_i \triangleq \frac{2M_i^2}{\mu^2} + 2D_{X_i}^2$, $a = \|\Gamma\|_\infty$, and $\mathbb{E}[\|x_{i,0} - x_i^*\|^2] \leq C^2$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. If $\eta = a$, then the following hold:*

a) Given any $\delta > 0$, we have

$$\ell_i{}^{(1)}(\eta) \leq \frac{Q_i}{a^4\ln(1/a^2)}\left(\frac{1}{\hat{\epsilon}}\right)^{2n'+\delta} + \left\lceil \ln\left(\frac{1}{\hat{\epsilon}}\right)\frac{2n'+\delta}{2\ln(a^{-1})} \right\rceil,$$

where $\hat{\epsilon} = \frac{C+D}{\epsilon}a^{-\frac{B_1-1}{B_1(n_0+1)}}$, $n_0 = \left\lceil \frac{B_2}{B_1} \right\rceil$, $n' = B_1(1+n_0)$ and $D = \frac{n'+2(n')^2\delta^{-1}}{e\ln(a^{-1})}$. In particular, if each player updates its strategy at each iteration, i.e., $B_1 = 1$, then

$$\ell_i{}^{(1)}(\eta) \leq \frac{Q_i}{a^4\ln(1/a^2)}\left(\frac{C+D}{\epsilon}\right)^{2(1+B_2)+\delta} + \left\lceil \ln\left(\frac{C+D}{\epsilon}\right)\frac{2(B_2+1)+\delta}{2\ln(a^{-1})} \right\rceil,$$

where $D = \frac{(1+B_2)+2(1+B_2)^2\delta^{-1}}{e\ln(a^{-1})}$. *Furthermore, if there is no communication delay, i.e.,* $B_2 = 0$*, then given any* $\delta > 0$ *we have that*

$$\ell_i{}^{(1)}(\eta) \leq \frac{Q_i}{a^4 \ln(1/a^2)} \left(\frac{C+D}{\epsilon}\right)^{2+\delta} + \left\lceil \ln\left(\frac{C+D}{\epsilon}\right) \frac{2+\delta}{2\ln(a^{-1})} \right\rceil, \tag{61}$$

where $D = \frac{1+2\delta^{-1}}{e\ln(a^{-1})}$.

b) Given any $\delta > 0$*, we have that*

$$\ell_i{}^{(2)}(\eta) \leq \frac{Q_i}{a^{2+\frac{2}{N}} \ln(1/a^{\frac{2}{N}})} \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\epsilon}}\right)^{2(n_0+1)+\delta} + \left\lceil \ln\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\epsilon}}\right) \frac{2(n_0+1)+\delta}{2\ln(a^{-1})/N} \right\rceil,$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon} \triangleq \frac{\epsilon}{C+D}\rho^{\frac{N-1}{N(1+n_0)}}$ *with* $n_0 = \lceil \frac{B_2}{N} \rceil$ *and* D *is defined by* (62)*. In particular, if there is no communication delay, i.e.,* $B_2 = 0$*, then given any* $\delta > 0$*,*

$$\ell_i{}^{(2)}(\eta) \leq \frac{Q_i}{a^{2+\frac{2}{N}} \ln(1/a^{\frac{2}{N}})} \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\epsilon}}\right)^{2+\delta} + \left\lceil \ln\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\epsilon}}\right) \frac{(2+\delta)N}{2\ln(a^{-1})} \right\rceil,$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon} \triangleq \frac{\epsilon}{C+D}\rho^{\frac{N-1}{N}}$ *and* $D = \frac{1+2N\delta^{-1}}{e\ln(a^{-1})}$.

Proof. a) Define $q(a,\eta) = ce^{\delta_0/2n'}$ with $\delta_0 = \frac{\delta\ln(a^{-1})}{n'+\delta/2}$. By $\eta = a$, we have that $\rho = a\rho^{-n_0}$. Hence $\rho = a^{\frac{1}{1+n_0}}$ and $c \triangleq \rho^{\frac{1}{B_1}} = a^{\frac{1}{n'}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln(1/q) &= \ln\left(1/a^{\frac{1}{n'}} e^{\delta_0/2n'}\right) = \frac{\ln(a^{-1})}{n'} - \frac{\delta_0}{2n'} = \frac{2\ln(a^{-1})}{2n'+\delta}, \\
\frac{\ln(1/\eta^2)}{\ln(1/q)} &= \frac{\ln(1/a^2)}{\ln(1/q)} = \frac{2\ln(a^{-1})}{\ln(1/q)} = 2n'+\delta \\
\text{and } \ D &= 1/\ln((q/c)^e) = 1/\ln(e^{\delta_0 e/2n'}) = \frac{2n'}{\delta_0 e} = \frac{n'+2(n')^2\delta^{-1}}{e\ln(a^{-1})}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by the expression $\ell_i{}^{(1)}(\eta)$ defined in (57), we show the first assertion of part (a). The rest two assertions can be easily followed by the definitions of n_0, n', and D.

b) Define $q(a,\eta) = ce^{\delta_0/2N(1+n_0)}$ with $\delta_0 = \frac{\delta\ln(a^{-1})}{1+n_0+\delta/2}$. By $\eta = a$, we have that $\rho = a\rho^{-n_0}$. Hence $c = \rho = a^{\frac{1}{1+n_0}}$ and $c \triangleq \rho^{\frac{1}{N}} = a^{\frac{1}{N(1+n_0)}}$. Then by $\tilde{\eta} = \eta^{1/N} = a^{1/N}$ we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln(1/q) &= \ln\left(1/a^{\frac{1}{N(1+n_0)}} e^{\delta_0/2N(1+n_0)}\right) = \frac{\ln(a^{-1}) - \delta_0/2}{N(1+n_0)} = \frac{2\ln(a^{-1})/N}{2(n_0+1)+\delta}, \\
\frac{\ln(1/\eta^2)}{\ln(1/q)} &= \frac{\ln(1/a^{2/N})}{\ln(1/q)} = \frac{2\ln(a^{-1})/N}{\ln(1/q)} = 2(n_0+1)+\delta,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$D = 1/\ln((q/c)^e) = 1/\ln(e^{\delta_0 e/2N(1+n_0)}) = \frac{2N(1+n_0)}{\delta_0 e} = N(1+n_0)\frac{1+2(1+n_0)\delta^{-1}}{e\ln(a^{-1})}. \tag{62}$$

Then by $\ell_i{}^{(2)}(\eta)$ defined in Proposition 6 we have proven the first assertion of part (b). If $B_2 = 0$, then by definitions of n_0 and D, we have that $n_0 = 0$ and $D = \frac{1+2N\delta^{-1}}{e\ln(a^{-1})}$. Thus, the rest assertion of part (b) holds. □

The complexity bounds given in the part (a) and part (b) of Theorem 4 are summarized as follows:

(a)-almost cyclic rule		
update frequency	delay	complexity bound
B_1	B_2	$\mathcal{O}\left((1/\epsilon)^{2B_1(1+\lceil\frac{B_2}{B_1}\rceil)+\delta}\right)$
1	B_2	$\mathcal{O}\left((1/\epsilon)^{2(1+B_2)+\delta}\right)$
1	0	$\mathcal{O}\left((1/\epsilon)^{2+\delta}\right)$

(b)-cyclic rule		
update frequency	delay	complexity bound
N	B_2	$\mathcal{O}\left((1/\epsilon)^{2(\lceil\frac{B_2}{N}\rceil+1)+\delta}\right)$
N	0	$\mathcal{O}\left((1/\epsilon)^{2+\delta}\right)$

Table 2: Summary of Complexity Bounds

Remark 8 *Based on established results, we make the following clarifications:*
(i) *If $B_1 = 1,\ B_2 = 0$, then the asynchronous algorithm degenerates to the synchronous algorithm. Notably, we achieve the complexity bound $\mathcal{O}\left(1/\epsilon^{2+\delta}\right)$ given by* (61) *in Theorem 4(a) compared with $\mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{N}/\epsilon\right)^{2+\delta}$ given in Proposition 5(c). This is because the definition of ϵ-Nash equilibrium by* (27) *(resp.* (56)*) as well as the analysis of Proposition 5(c) and Theorem 4 (a) are based on two-norm and infinity norm, respectively;*
(ii) *Assume that the players update in a cyclicly manner and $B_2 = 0$. Then the upper bound of iteration complexity is shown to be $\mathcal{O}\left(1/\epsilon^{2+\delta}\right)$ in Theorem 4(b), which is of the same order as that of the synchronous case given by* (61) *in Theorem 4(a).*
(iii) *From Proposition 6 and Theorem 4(b) we infer that for some specific selection of update indices in each iteration, we can get a much better upper bound than that given in Theorem 4(a). So, the update schemes of players are critical in improving the complexity bound. Nevertheless, these findings imply that the complexity bounds established in Theorem 4 for Algorithm 3 are optimal to some extent.*
(iv) *By the analysis of Algorithm 3 it is easily seen that the linear rate of convergence and the iteration complexity can also be established for Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 by replacing the assumption $\|\Gamma\| < 1$ with $\|\Gamma\|_\infty < 1$.*

Remark 9 *The assumption $\|\Gamma\|_\infty < 1$ can be further weakened to $\rho(\Gamma) < 1$ based on the following: By [28, Corollary 2.6.1], there exists a nonnegative vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that*

$$a \triangleq \max_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{w_i}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\gamma_{ij}w_j < 1.$$

Then by (5)*, we have that*

$$diag\{w\}^{-1}\begin{pmatrix}\|\widehat{x}_1(y') - \widehat{x}_1(y)\|\\ \vdots \\ \|\widehat{x}_N(y') - \widehat{x}_N(y)\|\end{pmatrix} \le diag\{w\}^{-1}\Gamma diag\{w\} diag\{w\}^{-1}\begin{pmatrix}\|y'_1 - y_1\|\\ \vdots \\ \|y'_N - y_N\|\end{pmatrix},$$

where $diag\{w\}$ is a diagonal matrix with the diagonal entries being w_i $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Similar to that given by the proof [14, Proposition 5] we have the following inequality:

$$\left\|diag\{w\}^{-1}\begin{pmatrix}\|\widehat{x}_1(y') - \widehat{x}_1(y)\|\\ \vdots \\ \|\widehat{x}_N(y') - \widehat{x}_N(y)\|\end{pmatrix}\right\|_\infty \le a\left\|diag\{w\}^{-1}\begin{pmatrix}\|y'_1 - y_1\|\\ \vdots \\ \|y'_N - y_N\|\end{pmatrix}\right\|_\infty,$$

by which we are able to establish the linear rate of convergence and the same order complexity bound for Algorithm 3 but with different constants.

6 Two-stage Recourse

In the previous two sections, we assumed that the functions $f_i(x)$ are twice differentiable, a requirement that is essential in deriving the contractive properties of the proximal best-response map. In this section, we weaken this

assumption while considering two-stage stochastic programs with recourse [29]. Consider a stochastic Nash game in which the ith player solves the following problem:

$$\min_{x_i \in X_i} \; f_i(x_i, x_{-i}) + h_i(x_i),$$

where $f_i(x_i, x_{-i}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\left[\psi_i(x_i, x^{-i}; \xi(\omega))\right]$ and $h_i(x_i)$ can be merely a convex, possibly nonsmooth, and an expectation-valued function. It is relatively simple to show that if the proximal-response map, constructed using the functions $f_1, \ldots, f_N$, admits a contractive property, then this modified problem also does admits a suitable property. Consequently, the only challenge that emerges is the need to get inexact solutions to the proximal best-response problem with an objective $f_i(x) + h_i(x_i)$ instead of merely $f_i(x)$. In this section, we consider a recourse-based model to introduce much needed flexibility into this framework.

Two-stage recourse-based stochastic programs originate from the work by Dantzig [29] and Beale [43] in the 50s. In the first stage, the decision-maker makes a decision prior to the revelation of the uncertainty, while in the second-stage, a scenario-specific decision is made contingent on the first-stage decision and on the realization of uncertainty. This second-stage decision is referred to as a *recourse* decision, which originates from the notion that in the second-stage, the decision-maker takes *recourse* based on the realization of uncertainty and on the first-stage decision. The expected cost of second-stage decisions is incorporated into the first-stage problem through the *recourse* function. This model has tremendous utility and finds applicability in financial planning, inventory control, power systems operation, amongst others (cf. [25, 44]). In the next two subsections, we incorporate two-stage linear recourse and quadratic recourse, respectively, into the framework of stochastic Nash equilibrium problem.

6.1 Linear Recourse

Suppose the problem (SNash(x_{-i})) is a two-stage stochastic program defined as follows:

$$\min_{x_i \in X_i} \; \mathbb{E}\left[\psi_i(x_i, x_{-i}; \omega)\right] + c_i(x_i) + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)], \tag{SNash$_{\rm rec}(x_{-i})$}$$

where $c_i(x_i)$ is the continuously differentiable convex cost of the first-stage decision x_i and $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)$ is defined as the optimal value of the problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{y_{i,\omega}} \quad & d_{i,\omega}^T y_{i,\omega} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & T_{i,\omega} x_i + W_i y_{i,\omega} = h_{i,\omega}, \\ & y_{i,\omega} \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{Rec$_{\rm LP}(x_i)$}$$

The function $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)$, being the cost of taking recourse given decision x_i and scenario ω, is shown to be convex in $x_i \in X_i$ for any given $\omega \in \Omega$ (See [25, Proposition 2.1]).

Given a strategy $y \in X$, player i can compute a proximal best-response $\widehat{x}_i(y)$ by solving the following stochastic optimization problem

$$\widehat{x}_i(y) \triangleq \operatorname*{argmin}_{x_i \in X_i} \left[\mathbb{E}[\psi_i(x_i, y_{-i}; \omega)] + c_i(x_i) + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)] + \frac{\mu}{2}\|x_i - y_i\|^2\right]. \tag{63}$$

It is easily seen that $\widehat{x}(\cdot)$ defined by (63) is a contractive map since $h_i(x_i) := c_i(x_i) + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)]$ is convex. We can also use Algorithms 1, 2, and 3 to find the Nash equilibrium of the problem (SNash$_{\rm rec}(x_{-i})$) but with $\widehat{x}_i(\bullet)$ defined by (63) instead of (2). We intend to use the stochastic gradient method to obtain an inexact proximal best-response solution. So, we impose the following condition on the problem (Rec$_{\rm LP}(x_i)$) to guarantee the existence and boundedness of the stochastic subgradient for function $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)\right]$.

Assumption 6 *For almost all $\omega \in \Omega$ and all $x_i \in X_i$,*
a) there exists a strictly positive vector $y_{i,\omega}$ such that $T_{i,\omega} x_i + W_i y_{i,\omega} = h_{i,\omega}$,
b) for any $v_{i,\omega} \geq 0$ with $W_i v_{i,\omega} = 0$, it holds that $d_{i,\omega}^T v_{i,\omega} \geq 0$,
c) $\mathbb{E}[\|T_{i,\omega}\|] < \infty$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

We adapt the following result from [25] to analyze the subgradient of $\mathcal{Q}(x_i, \omega)$.

Lemma 9 *Let Assumption 6 hold. Then for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$ and all $x_i \in X_i$,*
(i) $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)$ is finite and its subdifferential at x_i is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_i} \mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega) &= -T_{i,\omega}^T \mathcal{D}_i(x_i, \omega), \\ \text{where } \mathcal{D}_i(x_i, \omega) &\triangleq \underset{\pi_{i,\omega}: W_i^T \pi_{i,\omega} \le d_{i,\omega}}{\operatorname{argmax}} (h_{i,\omega} - T_{i,\omega} x_i)^T \pi_{i,\omega}; \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

(ii) $\mathcal{D}_i(x_i, \omega)$ defined by (64) *is bounded;*
(iii) there exists a positive constant $M_s > 0$ such that

$$E[\|s_i\|^2] \le M_s^2, \quad \forall s_i \in \partial \mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega). \tag{65}$$

Proof. (i) Assumption 6(a) implies the existence of feasible solution to problem ($\text{Rec}_{\text{LP}}(x_i)$). Then by Assumption 6(b), we see that for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$ and all $x_i \in X_i$, ($\text{Rec}_{\text{LP}}(x_i)$) has optimal solutions and $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)$ is finite. Thus, by [25, Proposition 2.2] we obtain the result.

(ii) Note that $h_{i,\omega} - T_{i,\omega} x_i$ is an interior point of the positive hull of matrix W_i by Assumption 6(a). It is shown in [25, p. 29] that the optimal solution set $\mathcal{D}_i(x_i, \omega)$ of (64) is bounded.

(iii) By Assumption 6(c) and the boundedness of $\mathcal{D}_i(x_i, \omega)$ we have the result. □

Since $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)$ is subdifferentiable, the stochastic approximation scheme for approximating the proximal best-response $\widehat{x}_i(y_k)$ is as follows:

$$z_{i,t+1} := \Pi_{X_i} \left[z_{i,t} - \gamma_t \left(\nabla_i c_i(z_{i,t}) + \nabla_{x_i} \psi_i(z_{i,t}, y_{-i,k}; \omega_{i,k}^t) + \mu(z_{i,t} - y_{i,k}) + s_{i,t} \right) \right], \tag{$\text{SA}_{i,k}^{rec}$}$$

where $z_{i,1} = x_{i,k}$, $\gamma_t = 1/\mu(t+1)$ and $s_{i,t} \in \partial \mathcal{Q}_i(z_{i,t}; \omega_{i,k}^t)$. In fact, the stochastic approximation scheme ($\text{SA}_{i,k}^{rec}$) requires a solution of the second-stage dual problem (64) to obtain a stochastic subgradient.

Since $\nabla_i c_i(\cdot)$ is continuous and X_i is compact, there exists $M_c > 0$ such that

$$\|\nabla_i c_i(x_i)\| \le M_c \ \ \forall x_i \in X_i.$$

Combined with Assumption 1(d), (18) and (65) yields that for any $x_i \in X_i, y \in X$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|\nabla_i c_i(x_i) + \nabla_{x_i} \psi_i(x_i, x_{-i}; \xi) + \mu(x_i - y_i) + s_i\|^2 \right] \le 4(M_i^2 + M_s^2 + M_c^2 + \mu^2 D_{X_i}^2).$$

By [25, Theorem 7.47] it is seen that $\mathbb{E}\left[\partial \mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)\right] \subset \partial \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)\right]$, and hence $s_{i,t} \in \partial \mathcal{Q}_i(z_{i,t}; \omega_{i,k}^t)$ is an unbiased estimate for some subgradient of $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)\right]$ at point $z_{i,t}$.

Consequently, Algorithms 1, 2, and 3 are applicable to the stochastic Nash game with linear-recourse. Further, the convergence results all hold for the problem ($\text{SNash}_{\text{rec}}(x_{-i})$) with $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)$ defined by ($\text{Rec}_{\text{LP}}(x_i)$), except that the constant $Q_i \triangleq \frac{2M_i^2}{\mu^2} + 2D_{X_i}^2$ is replaced by $Q_i \triangleq \frac{4(M_s^2 + M_c^2 + M_i^2)}{\mu^2} + 4D_{X_i}^2$.

6.2 Quadratic Recourse

In the past, two-stage stochastic quadratic programs with fixed recourse have been considered in [45, 46], where the first-stage term is a quadratic function and the second-stage term is the expectation of the minimum value of a quadratic program. In [45] and [46], the authors work with the recourse subproblems' dual that is approximated by a sequence of quadratic programming subproblems, and propose a Lagrangian finite generation technique and a Newton's method to solve the problem, respectively. In [47, 48], Dorn duality is employed in developing a Benders scheme. Motivated by this, we incorporate quadratic recourse in the stochastic Nash equilibrium problem and consider the two-stage problem ($\text{SNash}_{\text{rec}}(x_{-i})$), for which $c_i(x_i)$ is a continuously differentiable convex cost

of x_i, and the recourse function $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)$ is the optimal value of a convex quadratic program parameterized by the decision x_i and scenario ω:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_{y_{i,\omega}} & d_{i,\omega}^T y_{i,\omega} + \dfrac{1}{2} y_{i,\omega}^T H_{i,\omega} y_{i,\omega} \\ \text{subject to} & y_{i,\omega} \in \Upsilon_{i,\omega} \triangleq \{y_{i,\omega} \geq 0 : T_{i,\omega} x_i + W_i y_{i,\omega} = h_{i,\omega}\}, \end{array} \tag{$\mathrm{Rec_{QP}}(x_i)$}$$

where $H_{i,\omega}$ is a symmetric positive semidefinite matrix. By Dorn duality [49], a dual problem to ($\mathrm{Rec_{QP}}(x_i)$) has the following form:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \max\limits_{u_{i,\omega}, \pi_{i,\omega}} & \phi_i(x_i, u_{i,\omega}, \pi_{i,\omega}) \triangleq (h_{i,\omega} - T_{i,\omega} x_i)^T \pi_{i,\omega} - \dfrac{1}{2} u_{i,\omega}^T H_{i,\omega} u_{i,\omega} \\ \text{subject to} & (u_{i,\omega}, \pi_{i,\omega}) \in S_{i,\omega} \triangleq \{u_{i,\omega}, \pi_{i,\omega} : W_i^T \pi_{i,\omega} - H_{i,\omega} u_{i,\omega} \ \leq d_{i,\omega}\}. \end{array} \tag{66}$$

Assumption 7 *For any $x_i \in X_i$ and almost all $\omega \in \Omega$,*
a) there exists a strictly positive vector $y_{i,\omega}$ such that $T_{i,\omega} x_i + W_i y_{i,\omega} = h_{i,\omega}$;
b) for any $y_{i,\omega} \in \Upsilon_{i,\omega}, v_{i,\omega} \geq 0$ with $W_i v_{i,\omega} = 0, v_{i,\omega}^T H_{i,\omega} v_{i,\omega} = 0$, it holds that $(H_{i,\omega} y_{i,\omega} + d_{i,\omega})^T v_{i,\omega} \geq 0$;
c) $\mathbb{E}[\|T_{i,\omega}\|] < \infty$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

Before proceeding to show the finiteness of $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)$, we first provide a lemma concerning the existence of optimal solutions for quadratic programs. Consider a quadratic program in the following form:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} & \dfrac{1}{2} x^T D x + c^T x, \\ s.t. & x \in \Delta(A, b) \triangleq \{x \geq 0 : Ax = b\}, \end{array} \tag{67}$$

where $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is positive semidefinite. Then by [50, Corollary 2.6], we have the following lemma.

Lemma 10 *The problem* (67) *has a solution if and only if $\Delta(A, b)$ is nonempty and the following condition is satisfied:*

$$\text{If } \mathrm{x, v} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{n}} \text{ are such that } \mathrm{x} \in \Delta(\mathrm{A, b}), \mathrm{v} \geq 0, \mathrm{Av} = 0, \text{ and } \mathrm{v^T Dv} = 0, \text{ then } (\mathrm{Dx + c})^{\mathrm{T}} \mathrm{v} \geq 0.$$

Before giving the result, we state a simple result about the quadratic programming which may be proved directly or by invoking [51, Cor. 2.3.7].

Lemma 11 *Assume that the problem* (67) *has an optimal solution set S^*. Then the set DS^* contains a singleton.*

We now analyze the subdifferential of the recourse function.

Lemma 12 *Let Assumption 7 hold. Then we may claim the following:*
(a) The optimal solution set $S_{i,\omega}^{\mathrm{opt}}(x_i)$ of the dual problem (66) *is nonempty, $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega) = \max\limits_{(u_{i,\omega}, \pi_{i,\omega}) \in S_{i,\omega}} \phi_i(x_i, u_{i,\omega}, \pi_{i,\omega})$. Additionally, $\mathcal{D}_i(x_i, \omega) = \left\{\pi_{i,\omega}^{\mathrm{opt}}(x_i) : \left(u_{i,\omega}^{\mathrm{opt}}(x_i), \pi_{i,\omega}^{\mathrm{opt}}(x_i)\right) \in S_{i,\omega}^{\mathrm{opt}}(x_i)\right\}$ is a bounded set;*
(b) $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)$ is convex in $x_i \in X_i$ for any given $\omega \in \Omega$;
(c) $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)$ is subdifferentiable at x_i with $\partial_{x_i} \mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega) = -T_{i,\omega}^T \mathcal{D}_i(x_i, \omega)$. In particular, if $\mathcal{D}_i(x_i, \omega)$ consists of a unique point $\pi_{i,\omega}^{\mathrm{opt}}(x_i)$, then $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega)$ is differentiable at x_i with $\nabla_{x_i} \mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega) = -T_{i,\omega}^T \pi_{i,\omega}^{\mathrm{opt}}(x_i)$;
(d) there exists a positive constant $M_s > 0$ such that

$$E[\|s_i\|^2] \leq M_s^2 \ \ \forall s_i \in \partial \mathcal{Q}_i(x_i, \omega).$$

Proof. (a) By invoking Assumption 7 together with Lemma 10, we have that $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i,\omega)$ defined by problem ($\mathrm{Rec}_{\mathrm{QP}}(x_i)$) has at least one optimal solution $y^*_{i,\omega}$. Note that

$$T_{i,\omega}x_i + W_i y_{i,\omega} = h_{i,\omega} \Leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} W_i \\ -W_i \end{pmatrix} y_{i,\omega} \geq \begin{pmatrix} h_{i,\omega} - T_{i,\omega}x_i \\ -(h_{i,\omega} - T_{i,\omega}x_i) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then by [49, Theorem (Dual)-i] it is easily seen that a solution $\left(u^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i), \pi^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i)\right) = \left(y^*_{i,\omega}, \pi^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i)\right)$ exists to the dual problem (66) and $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i,\omega) = \max_{(u_{i,\omega},\pi_{i,\omega})\in S_{i,\omega}} \phi_i(x_i, u_{i,\omega}, \pi_{i,\omega})$.

By [49, Theorem (Dual)-ii] we see that for any $\left(u^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i), \pi^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i)\right) \in S^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i)$, a solution $y_{i,\omega}$ satisfying $H_{i,\omega}y_{i,\omega} = H_{i,\omega}u^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i)$ to problem ($\mathrm{Rec}_{\mathrm{QP}}(x_i)$) also exists. We denote by $O^{opt}_{i,\omega}$ the optimal solution set of problem ($\mathrm{Rec}_{\mathrm{QP}}(x_i)$). Then by Lemma 11, the set $H_{i,\omega}O^{opt}_{i,\omega}$ contains a singleton denoted by $H_{i,\omega}y^*_{i,\omega}$. Thus, for any $\left(u^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i), \pi^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i)\right) \in S^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i)$, $H_{i,\omega}u^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i)$ equals $H_{i,\omega}y^*_{i,\omega}$. As a result, by the optimality condition for problem (66) we see that for any $\left(u^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i), \pi^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i)\right) \in S^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i)$, $\pi^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i)$ is a solution of the following linear program

$$\begin{array}{ll} \max\limits_{\pi_{i,\omega}} & (h_{i,\omega} - T_{i,\omega}x_i)^T \pi_{i,\omega} \\ \text{subject to} & W_i^T \pi_{i,\omega} \leq H_{i,\omega}y^*_{i,\omega} + d_{i,\omega}. \end{array} \tag{68}$$

Note that $h_{i,\omega} - T_{i,\omega}x_i$ is an interior point of the positive hull of matrix W_i by Assumption 7(a). It is shown in [25, p. 29] that the optimal solution set of problem (68) is bounded. Hence the set $\mathcal{D}_i(x_i,\omega)$ is bounded.

(b) Since $\phi_i(x_i, u_{i,\omega}, \pi_{i,\omega})$ is convex in x_i for all $(u_{i,\omega}, \pi_{i,\omega}) \in S_{i,\omega}$, for any $\alpha \in [0,1]$ and any $x_i, x'_i \in X_i$

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_i(\alpha x_i + (1-\alpha)x'_i, u_{i,\omega}, \pi_{i,\omega}) &\leq \alpha\phi_i(x_i, u_{i,\omega}, \pi_{i,\omega}) + (1-\alpha)\phi_i(x'_i, u_{i,\omega}, \pi_{i,\omega}) \\ &\leq \alpha\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i,\omega) + (1-\alpha)\mathcal{Q}_i(x'_i,\omega), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from part (a). Taking the maximum with respect to $(u_{i,\omega}, \pi_{i,\omega}) \in S_{i,\omega}$ we obtain

$$\mathcal{Q}_i(\alpha x_i + (1-\alpha)x'_i,\omega) \leq \alpha\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i,\omega) + (1-\alpha)\mathcal{Q}_i(x'_i,\omega),$$

and hence the recourse function $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i,\omega)$ is convex in $x_i \in X_i$ for every $\omega \in \Omega$.

(c) Note that $\frac{\partial\phi_i(x_i,u_{i,\omega},\pi_{i,\omega})}{\partial x_i} = -T^T_{i,\omega}\pi_{i,\omega}$. Since $\mathcal{D}_i(x_i,\omega)$ is a compact convex set, by the proof of Danskin's theorem [52, Proposition A.22] we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i,\omega) &= \mathrm{conv}\{-T^T_{i,\omega}u_{i,\omega} : (u_{i,\omega}, \pi_{i,\omega}) \in S^{\mathrm{opt}}_{i,\omega}(x_i)\} \\ &= \mathrm{conv}\{-T^T_{i,\omega}u_{i,\omega} : u_{i,\omega} \in \mathcal{D}_i(x_i,\omega)\} \\ &= -T^T_{i,\omega}\mathcal{D}_i(x_i,\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the result follows.

(d) By Assumption 7(c) and the boundedness of $\mathcal{D}_i(x_i,\omega)$ we achieve the result. □

From Lemma 12(b) we see that $h_i(x_i) := c_i(x_i) + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i,\omega)]$ is convex. Then by recalling the fact that $f_1, \cdots, f_N$ admit a contractive property, we see that $\widehat{x}(\cdot)$ defined by (63) is a contractive map. As a result, the algorithm and convergence results shown in Section 6.1 for the problem ($\mathrm{SNash}_{\mathrm{rec}}(x_{-i})$) with $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i,\omega)$ defined by ($\mathrm{Rec}_{\mathrm{LP}}(x_i)$) still carry over to the problem ($\mathrm{SNash}_{\mathrm{rec}}(x_{-i})$) with $\mathcal{Q}_i(x_i,\omega)$ defined by ($\mathrm{Rec}_{\mathrm{quar}}(x_i)$).

7 Numerics

In this section, we demonstrate the performance of the proposed algorithms through an asset management problem. In Section 7.1, we formulate a portfolio investment problem and detailed descriptions of our simulations are provided in Section 7.2.

7.1 Competitive portfolio selection

The portfolio selection problem has a long history in the field of modern financial theory, dating back to the seminal work of Markowitz [53]. We consider the case where there are N investors that invest their capital in n assets. Assume that investor $i \in \mathcal{N} = \{1, \cdots, N\}$ invests an amount x_{ij} in asset $j \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$. Suppose that the asset $j = 1, \cdots, n$ has a return rate r_j, which is a random variable with expectation $\nu_j = \mathbb{E}[r_j]$. Let $R = \mathbb{E}[(r-\nu)(r-\nu)^T] \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ denote the (positive definite) covariance matrix with $R_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[(r_i-\nu_i)(r_j-\nu_j)]$, where $r = (r_1, \cdots, r_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\nu = (\nu_1, \cdots, \nu_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then for investor $i \in \mathcal{N}$, the expected return is $\sum_{j=1}^n \nu_j x_{ij} = \nu^T x_i$, while the risk characterized by the variance of the return is $\mathbb{E}[\left(r^T x_i - \nu^T x_i\right)^2] = x_i^T R x_i$, where $x_i = (x_{i1}, \cdots, x_{in})^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The expected return ν_i and the variance R_i of asset $i = 1, \cdots, n$ can be estimated from its history. If the investor only concentrates on maximizing its expected return, it can just invest all its capital in one asset with the largest expected return rate but this might be a risky strategy. An alternative scheme is to maximize the expected return while keeping the risk in a suitable level, and hence a trade-off function between risk and return in the following form might be appropriate:

$$U_i(x_i) \triangleq \rho_i x_i^T R x_i - \nu^T x_i,$$

where $\rho_i > 0$ is the risk-aversion parameter of investor i, and larger ρ_i results in a larger emphasis on risk.

In a practical market incorporating multiple investors, trades of diverse investors are usually pooled and executed together [54, 55]. The transaction cost for a single investor may depend on the overall trading levels in the market and not just its own trading. Each investor i has an initial holding x_i^0, the transaction price is a function of trade size $x_j - x_j^0 \ \forall j \in \mathcal{N}$ from all investors, e.g., the price takes the form $\phi(\omega)\sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - x_i^0)$, where $\phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is a diagonal random matrix with diagonal entries being positive. Besides, the transaction cost of each investor is proportional to its trade size. Based on the above considerations, the portfolio selection problem of investor i can be modeled as a stochastic optimization problem given by the following:

$$\min_{x_i \in X_i} \qquad f_i(x_i, x_{-i}) = \mathbb{E}\left[\psi_i(x_i, x_{-i}; \phi(\omega))\right],$$

where X_i denotes the set of feasible portfolios of player i, and

$$\psi_i(x_i, x_{-i}; \phi(\omega)) = U_i(x_i) + (x_i - x_i^0)^T \phi(\omega) \sum_{j=1}^N (x_j - x_j^0).$$

Then

$$\nabla_{x_i} \psi_i(x_i, x_{-i}; \phi(\omega)) = 2\rho_i R x_i + 2\phi(\omega)(x_i - x_i^0) - \nu + \phi(\omega) \sum_{j\neq i} (x_j - x_j^0).$$

We let $\mathbb{E}[\phi(\omega)]$ be denoted by Φ. Then we have that for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$, we have

$$\nabla^2_{x_i} f_i(x) = 2\rho_i R + 2\Phi, \ \ \nabla^2_{x_i x_j} f_i(x) = \Phi \ \ \forall j \neq i.$$

Assume that the parameters ρ_i, R, Φ satisfy the following condition

$$\lambda_{\min}(2\rho_i R + 2\Phi) > (N-1)\|\Phi\| \ \ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{69}$$

If condition (69) holds, then $\|\Gamma\|_\infty < 1$. Since both R and Φ are symmetric and positive definite matrices, all of their eigenvalues are strictly positive. Then for sufficiently large ρ_i, condition (69) certainly holds. Notably, large ρ_i means that investor i is more risk-averse.

7.2 Numerical results

In the numerical investigation, we consider a market of 6 investors and 4 assets, i.e., $N = 6, n = 4$. Set $\nu = (0.5, 0.35, 0.4, 0.3)$ and let R be a diagonal matrix with $R_{11} = 0.16, R_{22} = 0.1, R_{33} = 0.12, R_{44} = 0.09$. Let each diagonal of $\phi(\omega)$ be a random variable satisfying a uniform distribution $[0.12, 0.18]$, and hence $\Phi = 0.15\mathbf{I}_4$. Set $\rho_i = 3 + i/N$. Let $X_i = \{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_{ij} \geq 0, x_{ij} \leq \text{cap}_{ij}, j = 1, \cdots, n\}$ with $\text{cap}_{ij} = 0.5$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $j = 1, \cdots, n$. We set the initial holdings $x_{ij}^0 = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $j = 1, \cdots, n$. Throughout this section, we assume that the empirical mean of the error is calculated by averaging across 50 trajectories generated from the stochastic approximation scheme.

7.2.1 Convergence of the Synchronous Algorithm

We now present simulations for Algorithm 1 and examine its empirical convergence rate and iteration complexity. Define $a = \|\Gamma\|$, where Γ is defined by (3). Suppose that $j_{i,k} = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\eta^{2k}} \right\rceil$ steps of the standard stochastic approximation scheme ($\text{SA}_{i,k}$) are taken at major iteration k to get an inexact solution to (7), where $\eta = a^{\kappa/2}$ for some $\kappa > 0$. Then by Lemma 3 we see that $\alpha_{i,k} = 1/\sqrt{j_{i,k}} \leq \eta^k$, and hence the sequence $\{\alpha_{i,k}\}$ is summable by noting that $\eta \in (0, 1)$. We carry out simulations for different selections of μ, κ, for each case the smallest number of projected stochastic gradient steps each player has carried out to obtain $u_k \leq$ 2.5e-03 is listed in Table 3, where u_k is defined in (15). From this table, it is seen that the parameters μ, κ play an important rule in the overall iteration complexity.

μ \ κ	0.8	1.2	1.6	2	2.4	2.8	3.2	3.6
0.75	10240	7694	5908	5076	4125	4176	3237	2941
1	8354	5684	4351	4192	3018	2428	2782	2740
1.25	7266	5117	4051	3068	3010	2724	1876	2635
1.5	6178	4325	3407	2862	2501	1910	1813	1928
1.75	6168	4173	2993	2732	2178	1783	1784	1514
2	5572	3765	2709	2652	2300	2054	1769	1594
2.25	5153	3477	2774	2608	2090	1956	1455	1339
2.5	4637	3755	2848	2582	1692	1609	1491	1433

Table 3: Empirical iteration complexity for the synchronous algorithm with different μ and η

Empirical convergence rate and iteration complexity of summable $\{\alpha_{i,k}\}$: Suppose $j_{i,k} = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\eta^{2k}} \right\rceil$ steps of ($\text{SA}_{i,k}$) are taken at major iteration k to get an inexact solution to (7). The rate of convergence of u_k is shown in Figure 1, which demonstrates that the iterates converge in mean to the unique equilibrium at a linear rate. We further examine the convergence behavior of Algorithm 1 with $\mu = 2, \eta = a$ by plotting the error bar of $x_{11,k}$, where the blue line denotes the trajectory of the mean sequence computed via the sample average, the black dashed line denotes the equilibrium strategy x_{11}^*, while the red bars capture the variance of $x_{11,k}$. Figure 2 shows that the equilibrium estimate approaches zero both with probability one and in mean with the variance across the samples decaying to zero. This corresponds well with the theoretical findings that the iterates converge a.s. to the Nash equilibrium and that the variance of the iterates $\{x_k\}$ converges to zero by Proposition 2 and Proposition 3(b), respectively. The empirical relation between ϵ and $K(\epsilon)$ is shown in Figures 4(a) and 4(b), where $K(\epsilon)$ denotes the smallest number of overall projected stochastic gradient steps each player has carried out to make $u_k < \epsilon$. The red solid curve represents the empirical data, while the blue dashed curve demonstrates the corresponding quadratic fit, which aligns well with the empirical data. It indicates that the empirical iteration complexity is of order $(1/\epsilon^2)$ in this simulation setting.

Performance of Algorithm 1 for non-summable $\alpha_{i,k}$: While the previous numerical simulations are all for summable inexactness sequence $\{\alpha_{i,k}\}$, we now investigate the performance for non-summable $\{\alpha_{i,k}\}$. Let $\mu = 2$ and suppose $j_{i,k} = k^2$ steps of the stochastic approximation scheme ($\text{SA}_{i,k}$) are taken at major iteration k to



Figure 1: Linear Convergence of Synchronous Algorithm



Figure 2: Almost Sure Convergence of Synchronous Algorithm with Summable $\{\alpha_{i,k}\}$



Figure 3: Almost Sure Convergence of Synchronous Algorithm with Unsummable $\{\alpha_{i,k}\}$



(a) Summable $\alpha_{i,k}$



(b) Summable $\alpha_{i,k}$



(c) Non-summable $\alpha_{i,k}$

Figure 4: Empirical Iteration Complexity and Quadratic Fitting of Synchronous Algorithm

get an inexact solution to (7). Then by Lemma 3, we see that $\alpha_{i,k} = 1/k$, for which the sequence $\{\alpha_{i,k}\}$ is not summable. We plot the error bar of $x_{11,k}$ in Figure 3, where the blue line denotes the trajectory of the mean sequence, the black dashed line denotes the equilibrium strategy x^*_{11}, and the red bars denotes the variance of $x_{11,k}$. It shows that the variance across the samples decays to zero, which is consistent with Proposition 3(b) by noting that $\alpha_{i,k} \to 0$. Figure 3 also displays that the estimates appear to converge a.s. to the Nash equilibrium though we cannot theoretically claim this from Proposition 2 since $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{i,k} = \infty$. Further, the empirical relation between ϵ and $K(\epsilon)$ is shown in Figure 4(c) with the red solid curve representing the empirical data and the blue dashed curve demonstrating the corresponding quadratic fit. It is easily seen that the complexity bound of non-summable $\{\alpha_{i,k}\}$ is worse than that of summable $\{\alpha_{i,k}\}$ as shown in Figure 4.

Comparisons with stochastic gradient method: Set $\mu = 2.5$ and suppose $j_{i,k} = \lceil \frac{1}{a^{3k}} \rceil$ steps of (SA$_{i,k}$) are taken at major iteration k to get an inexact solution to (7). We carry out simulations for both the synchronous inexact proximal algorithm and the standard stochastic gradient method for computing a stochastic Nash equilibrium. We compare the two methods in terms of the overall iteration complexity and communication overhead for achieving the same accuracy. The empirically observed relationship between ϵ and $K(\epsilon)$ for both methods are shown in Figure 5. From the figure, it can be observed that the iteration complexity are of the same orders while the constant of the stochastic gradient method is superior to that of Algorithm 1. However the stochastic gradient method requires the rivals' newest information to carry out a single projected gradient step, the resulting communication overhead is proportional to the the overall iteration complexity. In contrast, the synchronous inexact proximal algorithm carries out multiple projected gradient steps without requiring the most recent rivals' information. The communication overhead of the stochastic gradient method and Algorithm 1 is compared in Figure 6. From the results demonstrated in Figure 5 and Figure 6, we conclude that Algorithm 1 compares well with the stochastic gradient method in terms of overall projected gradient steps while showing markedly less communication overhead. In fact, in certain applications, high communication overhead tends to render a scheme impractical.



Figure 5: Comparison of Iteration Complexity



Figure 6: Comparison of Communication Overhead

7.2.2 Convergence of the Randomized and Asynchronous Schemes

We now run simulations for Algorithm 2, where at iteration k, a player is chosen to update with equal probability, i.e., $p_i = 1/N \; \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$. Suppose $j_{i,k} = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\eta^{2(\beta_{i,k}+1)}} \right\rceil$ steps of the stochastic approximation scheme (SA$_{i,k}$) are taken at major iteration k to get an inexact solution satisfying (31), where $\eta = a^{\kappa/2}$ for some $\kappa > 0$. The trajectories of u_k are shown in Figure 7, while the empirical mean of the number of projected gradient steps is displayed in Figure 8. It is seen that randomized algorithm still displays linear convergence but its empirical iteration complexity of randomized algorithm is larger than that of the synchronous algorithm, a less surprising observation.



Figure 7: Linear Convergence of Randomized Algorithm



Figure 8: Iteration Complexity of Randomized Algorithm

Next, we simulate the performance of the asynchronous Algorithm 3, where for any $k \geq 0, i \in I_k, j \in \mathcal{N}$, the communication delays $\tau_{ij}(k)$ are independently generated from a uniform distribution on the set $\{0, 1, \cdots, B_2\}$. Set $\mu = 2, \eta = a, B_1 = 1$. Suppose that $j_{i,k} = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\eta^{2k}} \right\rceil$ steps of the stochastic approximation scheme (55) are taken at major iteration k to get an inexact solution to problem (43). We carry out simulations for different communication delays $B_2 = 0, 4, 8, 12$. The trajectories of u_k is shown in Figure 9, from which it is observed that the iterates produced by Algorithm 3 converge in mean to the unique equilibrium at a linear rate; however, the trajectories tend to display less of the monotonically decreasing behavior that characterizes the synchronous schemes. The empirically obsered iteration complexity is plotted in Figure 10 and we note that this worsens as B_2 grows.



Figure 9: Linear Convergence of Asynchronous Algorithm



Figure 10: Iteration Complexity of Asynchronous Algorithm

7.2.3 Comparisons of Empirical and Theoretical Results

Set $\rho_i = 4$ for $i = 1, \cdots, N$. Let each player take 40 best-response steps and the inexact proximal best-response solution be computed via a stochastic approximation scheme. The theoretical and empirical rate of convergence are shown in Table 4, from which it is seen that the theoretical error bound is relatively conservative while the empirical error is seen to be far smaller in practice.

parameters		synchronous		randomized		asynchronous	
		empirical	theoretical	empirical	theoretical	empirical	theoretical
$\mu = 1$	$\eta = a^{0.5}$	2e-03	1.89	2.64e-03	1.98e+01	1.43e-03	1.36e+01
	$\eta = a^{0.75}$	4.76e-04	7.18e-01	7.42e-04	1.73e+01	3.24e-04	1.36e+01
	$\eta = a$	1.08e-04	3.18e-01	2.27e-04	1.53e+01	7.94e-05	1.37e+01
$\mu = 2$	$\eta = a^{0.5}$	6.1e-03	6.98	7.88e-03	2.49e+01	4.33e-03	3.69e+01
	$\eta = a^{0.75}$	2.26e-03	3.89	3.3e-03	2.27e+01	1.72e-03	3.69e+01
	$\eta = a$	9.39e-04	2.33	1.39e-03	2.09e+01	6.9e-04	3.69e+01
$\mu = 5$	$\eta = a^{0.5}$	1.3e-02	2.6e+01	2.06e-02	3.16e+01	1.11e-02	9.62e+01
	$\eta = a^{0.75}$	7.5e-03	2.01e+01	1.24e-02	3.01e+01	6.55e-03	9.62e+01
	$\eta = a$	4.8e-03	1.58e+01	8.4e-03	2.89e+01	4.2e-03	9.62e+01

Table 4: Comparision of theoretical and empirical error

8 Concluding Remarks

This paper considers a class of Nash games where each player's payoff function is expectation-valued. We propose a synchronous inexact proximal best-response scheme to solve the problem as well as a randomized and an asynchronous variant. Under suitable contractive properties on the proximal response map, we separately prove that all proposed schemes produce iterates that converge in mean to the unique equilibrium at a linear rate. In addition, we derive the overall iteration complexity for computing an ϵ-Nash equilibrium in terms of projected stochastic gradient steps. Furthermore, we consider generalizations that allow for private recourse by allowing for each player to solve a two-stage stochastic Nash game with either linear or quadratic second-stage problems. Finally, preliminary numerical studies support the theoretical findings in terms of asymptotic behavior and rate statements.

References

[1] G. Scutari and D. P. Palomar, "Mimo cognitive radio: A game theoretical approach," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 761–780, 2010.

[2] G. Scutari, D. P. Palomar, and S. Barbarossa, "The mimo iterative waterfilling algorithm," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 1917–1935, 2009.

[3] F. Facchinei and J. Pang, *Nash equilibria: The variational approach*, ser. Convex Optimization in Signal Processing and Communications. Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, England), 2009.

[4] G. Scutari, F. Facchinei, P. Song, D. P. Palomar, and J.-S. Pang, "Decomposition by partial linearization in multiuser systems," in *Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2013 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 4424–4428.

[5] J. Koshal, A. Nedic, and U. V. Shanbhag, "Regularized iterative stochastic approximation methods for stochastic variational inequality problems," *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 594–609, March 2013.

[6] D. Fudenberg and J. Tirole, *Game Theory*. MIT Press, 1991.

[7] T. Basar and G. J. Olsder, *Dynamic noncooperative game theory*. SIAM, 1999, vol. 23.

[8] J. F. Nash, Jr., "Equilibrium points in n-person games," *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 36, pp. 48–49, 1950.

[9] T. Başar, "Control and game-theoretic tools for communication networks," *Appl. Comput. Math.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 104–125, 2007.

[10] T. Alpcan and T. Basar, "Distributed algorithms for Nash equilibria of flow control games," *Annals of Dynamic Games*, vol. 7, 2003. [Online]. Available: citeseer.ifi.unizh.ch/alpcan03distributed.html

[11] H. Yin, U. V. Shanbhag, and P. G. Mehta, "Nash equilibrium problems with scaled congestion costs and shared constraints," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 56, no. 7, pp. 1702–1708, 2011. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2011.2137590

[12] J.-S. Pang, G. Scutari, D. P. Palomar, and F. Facchinei, "Design of cognitive radio systems under temperature-interference constraints: A variational inequality approach," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 3251–3271, 2010.

[13] T. Alpcan, T. Basar, R. Srikant, and E. Altman, "CDMA uplink power control as a noncooperative game," *Wireless Networks*, vol. 8, pp. 659– 669, November 2002. [Online]. Available: citeseer.ifi.unizh.ch/alpcan01cdma.html

[14] G. Scutari, F. Facchinei, J.-S. Pang, and D. P. Palomar, "Real and complex monotone communication games," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 7, pp. 4197–4231, 2014.

[15] U. Ravat and U. V. Shanbhag, "On the characterization of solution sets of smooth and nonsmooth convex stochastic Nash games," *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 1168–1199, 2011. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/100792644

[16] U. V. Shanbhag, G. Infanger, and P. W. Glynn, "A complementarity framework for forward contracting under uncertainty," *Oper. Res.*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 810–834, 2011. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/opre.1110.0947

[17] A. Kannan, U. V. Shanbhag, and H. M. Kim, "Addressing supply-side risk in uncertain power markets: stochastic nash models, scalable algorithms and error analysis," *Optimization Methods and Software*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 1095–1138, 2013.

[18] ——, "Strategic behavior in power markets under uncertainty," *Energy Systems*, vol. 2, no. 2, p. 115, 2011.

[19] A. Ehrenmann and Y. Smeers, "Generation capacity expansion in a risky environment: a stochastic equilibrium analysis," *Operations research*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 1332–1346, 2011.

[20] G. Gürkan and J.-S. Pang, "Approximations of Nash equilibria," *Math. Program.*, vol. 117, no. 1-2, Ser. B, pp. 223–253, 2009. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10107-007-0156-y

[21] A. Kannan and U. V. Shanbhag, "Distributed computation of equilibria in monotone nash games via iterative regularization techniques," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 1177–1205, 2012. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/110825352

[22] D. Fudenberg and D. K. Levine, *The theory of learning in games*, ser. MIT Press Series on Economic Learning and Social Evolution. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998, vol. 2.

[23] F. Yousefian, A. Nedić, and U. V. Shanbhag, "Self-tuned stochastic approximation schemes for non-lipschitzian stochastic multi-user optimization and Nash games," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. PP, no. 99, pp. 1–1, 2015.

[24] J. S. Pang, S. Sen, and U. V. Shanbhag, "Two-stage noncooperative games with risk-averse players," *Under 2nd review*, 2016.

[25] A. Shapiro, D. Dentcheva, and A. Ruszczyński, *Lectures on stochastic programming*, ser. MPS/SIAM Series on Optimization. Philadelphia, PA: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), 2009, vol. 9, modeling and theory. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/1.9780898718751

[26] Y. Nesterov, "Efficiency of coordinate descent methods on huge-scale optimization problems," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 341–362, 2012.

[27] P. L. Combettes and J.-C. Pesquet, "Stochastic quasi-fejér block-coordinate fixed point iterations with random sweeping," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 1221–1248, 2015.

[28] D. P. Bertsekas and J. N. Tsitsiklis, *Parallel and distributed computation: numerical methods*. Prentice hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1989, vol. 23.

[29] G. B. Dantzig, "Linear programming under uncertainty," *Management science*, vol. 1, no. 3-4, pp. 197–206, 1955.

[30] H. Robbins and S. Monro, "A stochastic approximation method," *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pp. 400–407, 1951.

[31] B. Polyak, *Introduction to optimization*. New York: Optimization Software, Inc., 1987.

[32] H. Ahmadi, "On the analysis of data-driven and distributed algorithms for convex optimization problems," Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering, Pennsylvania State University, 2016.

[33] Y. S. Chow and H. Teicher, *Probability theory: independence, interchangeability, martingales*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[34] P. Richtárik and M. Takáč, "Iteration complexity of randomized block-coordinate descent methods for minimizing a composite function," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 144, no. 1-2, pp. 1–38, 2014.

[35] Z. Lu and L. Xiao, "Randomized block coordinate non-monotone gradient method for a class of nonlinear programming," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.5918*, 2013.

[36] T. C. Aysal, M. E. Yildiz, A. D. Sarwate, and A. Scaglione, "Broadcast gossip algorithms for consensus," *IEEE Transactions on Signal processing*, vol. 57, no. 7, pp. 2748–2761, 2009.

[37] S. Boyd, A. Ghosh, B. Prabhakar, and D. Shah, "Randomized gossip algorithms," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON)*, vol. 14, no. SI, pp. 2508–2530, 2006.

[38] H. Robbins and D. Siegmund, "A convergence theorem for non negative almost supermartingales and some applications," in *Herbert Robbins Selected Papers*. Springer, 1985, pp. 111–135.

[39] D. Chazan and W. Miranker, "Chaotic relaxation," *Linear algebra and its applications*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 199–222, 1969.

[40] U. V. Shanbhag, J. Pang, and S. Sen, "Inexact best-response schemes for stochastic nash games: Linear convergence and iteration complexity analysis," in *55th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, CDC 2016, Las Vegas, NV, USA, December 12-14, 2016*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 3591–3596. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/CDC.2016.7798809

[41] P. Tseng, "On the rate of convergence of a partially asynchronous gradient projection algorithm," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 603–619, 1991.

[42] Y. Xu and W. Yin, "Block stochastic gradient iteration for convex and nonconvex optimization," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 1686–1716, 2015.

[43] E. M. L. Beale, "On minimizing a convex function subject to linear inequalities," *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B.*, vol. 17, pp. 173–184; discussion, 194–203, 1955, (Symposium on linear programming.).

[44] J. R. Birge and F. Louveaux, *Introduction to Stochastic Programming: Springer Series in Operations Research*. Springer, 1997.

[45] R. T. Rockafellar and R.-B. Wets, "A lagrangian finite generation technique for solving linear-quadratic problems in stochastic programming," in *Stochastic Programming 84 Part II*. Springer, 1986, pp. 63–93.

[46] X. Chen, L. Qi, and R. S. Womersley, "Newton's method for quadratic stochastic programs with recourse," *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 60, no. 1-2, pp. 29–46, 1995.

[47] A. A. Kulkarni and U. V. Shanbhag, "Recourse-based stochastic nonlinear programming: properties and Benders-SQP algorithms," *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 77–123, 2012. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10589-010-9316-8

[48] U. V. Shanbhag, "Decomposition and sampling methods for stochastic equilibrium problems," *Department of Management Science and Engineering (Operations Research), Stanford University. Ph. D. thesis*, 2006.

[49] W. S. Dorn, "Duality in quadratic programming," *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 155–162, 1960.

[50] G. M. Lee, N. N. Tam, and N. D. Yen, *Quadratic programming and affine variational inequalities: a qualitative study*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006, vol. 78.

[51] F. Facchinei and J.-S. Pang, *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems. Vol. I*, ser. Springer Series in Operations Research. New York: Springer-Verlag, 2003.

[52] D. P. Bertsekas, "Control of uncertain systems with a set-membership description of the uncertainty," DTIC Document, Tech. Rep., 1971.

[53] H. Markowitz, "Portfolio selection," *The journal of finance*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 77–91, 1952.

[54] C. O'Cinneide, B. Scherer, and X. Xu, "Pooling trades in a quantitative investment process," *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 33–43, 2006.

[55] Y. Yang, F. Rubio, G. Scutari, and D. P. Palomar, "Multi-portfolio optimization: A potential game approach," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 61, no. 22, pp. 5590–5602, 2013.